



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 22, 2019

No. 86

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable MARSHA BLACKBURN, a Senator from the State of Tennessee.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Our Father in Heaven, supply the needs of our Senators. Meet them with new insights for the good of our Nation and world. Lord, provide them with fresh strength so they will not become weary in doing what is right. Give them the long view of their work. Inspire them with the vibrant belief that it is better to fail in a cause that will ultimately succeed than to succeed in a cause that will ultimately fail. Strengthen them this day with the positive assurance of Your eternal presence.

We pray in Your loving Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 22, 2019.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable MARSHA BLACKBURN, a

Senator from the State of Tennessee, to perform the duties of the Chair.

CHUCK GRASSLEY,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. BLACKBURN thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

S. 1541

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, on Monday, I introduced legislation to raise the national minimum age for purchasing tobacco products from 18 to 21. I walked through the long history of our Nation's complicated relationship with this major cash crop. I laid out the challenges facing tobacco farmers in Kentucky and in other States and the new opportunities some of them are actually turning to. I explained why, as we see signs of a new public health crisis of nicotine addiction in the younger generation, now is the time to take decisive new action.

Together with Senator TIM KAINE, who represents another State with a very long history of tobacco production, I was proud to introduce the bill that builds on the existing structure that is already in place and simply raises the minimum age to 21. Rather than reinvent the wheel here in Washington, it would set one national standard for enforcing new age-21 restrictions. It is a bill designed with States in mind, and it would allow States to take measures even more restrictive than Federal law if they choose.

Senator KAINE and I have been grateful to see—already, even in just the past few days—substantial support and recognition from public health advocates that our approach is the right way to address this pressing issue.

Already, our legislation has earned the support of leading voices like the American Cancer Society, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American College of Cardiology, the American Heart Association, the American Lung Association, the American Osteopathic Association, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the Foundation for a Healthy Kentucky, the Kentucky Hospital and Medical Associations, and many others. Here are just a few things these supporters of our bill had to say:

One advocate called it a “critical step forward that will profoundly improve the health of our children and future generations.”

Another stated our legislation “will be instrumental in stemming the epidemic of vaping that is afflicting children as young as middle school.”

Yet another said our bill could potentially “save hundreds of thousands of lives.”

This should be an area where we all lock arms to get results. I am proud this body will have a chance to take action and stem the tide of addiction among our Nation's youth. I am proud to be standing with Senator KAINE. I hope each of our colleagues will recognize the opportunity before us, avoid making this important issue any kind of partisan football, and join in supporting the Tobacco-Free Youth Act.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, since President Trump took office in 2017, the Senate has confirmed 41 well-qualified individuals to serve on our Nation's circuit courts. No. 41 was Daniel Collins of California, whom we confirmed yesterday to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. As I have noted already, Mr. Collins came before the Senate with every conceivable indicator of a brilliant legal mind and an impeccable professional record. I was proud that the full Senate followed up

• This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S3017

the Judiciary Committee's favorable report with a majority vote here on the floor.

But our work this week is just beginning. Yesterday, the Senate also advanced four more nominees—these to serve on district courts across the country. Today, we will vote to confirm all four.

The first, Howard Nielson, has been nominated for the District of Utah. As I mentioned yesterday, Mr. Nielson has clerked for both the Fourth Circuit and the Supreme Court and has assembled an impressive record at the Department of Justice and in the private sector.

Next will come the nomination of Stephen Clark for the Eastern District of Missouri. Mr. Clark is an accomplished litigator with nearly three decades of experience in practice.

The third nominee is Carl Nichols, the President's choice to serve as district judge for the District of Columbia. You will start to detect a pattern because he, too, is a thoroughly impressive nominee—clerkships for the DC Circuit and for the Supreme Court for Justice Thomas, service at the Department of Justice, and recognized excellence in private practice.

Finally, we will vote on Kenneth Bell, nominated to serve in the Western District of North Carolina. Mr. Bell has under his belt nearly two decades of service in the Office of the U.S. Attorney—distinguished by national honors for his accomplishments as a prosecutor—as well as extensive experience in the private sector.

So if I am sounding like a broken record, it is because the White House continues to submit one extremely well-qualified and highly impressive nominee after another to sit on the Federal bench. These are men and women who are bright, talented, well-regarded, and committed to applying what the text of our laws and our Constitution actually say.

Today, we can take four more steps in that positive direction. These nominees deserve big bipartisan votes, so I hope each of my colleagues will join me in voting to confirm each of them.

DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, now on one final matter, several of our Senate colleagues and their counterparts in the House are continuing to zero in on long-overdue legislation to deliver additional help to Americans all across the Nation who are struggling to rebuild from natural disasters. This ought to have been a fairly straightforward process. We shouldn't need to explain why the need for this relief is urgent, but just for good measure, let's remember the Americans who are counting on us.

In California, last year's string of wildfires included the deadliest and most destructive fire on record. It killed 85 people and burned more than 150,000 acres.

In the Midwest earlier this year, storm surges flooded whole swaths of States and racked up millions of dollars in damages. As one expert recently put it, "We have points in Iowa and Illinois that have been in flood stage for over 30 days"—30 days—"which hasn't occurred since we started keeping records—and some of them go back 150 years."

Across the Southeast and gulf coasts, recent hurricane seasons have left lasting scars. Hurricane Michael, which swept across Florida into South Georgia last October, has itself produced nearly 150,000 insurance claims in Florida alone.

In Alabama, more tornadoes have already been recorded in 2019 than in all of last year. One that touched down in Lee County on March 3 left 23 people dead.

Nearly 2 years after Hurricane Maria tore across Puerto Rico, too many storefronts are still shuttered, too many homes still lack roofs, and power remains too unreliable.

And the list goes on.

This is hardly the first time facts like these have been laid out here on the floor. In fact, this legislation has already taken far too long—far too long—to deliver. But now that we are in the home stretch, it is past time to put partisan politics aside, move past any tangential questions, and secure a final agreement that can become law; that is, something that can both pass the Democratic House and earn the President's signature soon. That is how to make a law in this situation.

The Senate will vote on disaster relief this week. The Members of this body will not return home for Memorial Day without taking further action to help these struggling communities, which, by the way, include a number of military installations that need assistance to recover and to rebuild.

It is my sincere hope that we will be able to vote on a negotiated, bipartisan, bicameral solution. That is how we can get to an outcome. That is what affected Americans deserve.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, it has been a frightening 2 weeks for tens of millions of Americans who support a

woman's freedom to make her own healthcare choices. Actually, if you believe the polls, there are hundreds of millions of Americans in that category.

Republican legislators across the country have passed some of the most extreme restrictions on a woman's right to choose. With breathtaking speed, they are trying to take us backward, but they have already provoked a fierce reaction among the American people.

Just yesterday, I stood with hundreds before the Supreme Court to speak on behalf of Americans everywhere who believe that women don't deserve to be treated this way by their government. Meanwhile, here in the Senate, the Republican leader is once again stalling—it seems to be his MO—on a bill to improve legal protections for women who are victims of domestic abuse, assault, and stalking. This is VAWA, or the Violence Against Women Act.

VAWA has been a landmark piece of legislation, and it has greatly reduced the abuse of women. Well, there was an improved and expanded VAWA that was passed by the House of Representatives on a bipartisan basis. It got significant Republican votes. It brings much needed updates to existing Federal law. It finally expands protections to women who are victims of violence from domestic partners or former partners, not just current or former spouses. It also says that if you are known to stalk your partner or have a restraining order against you, you shouldn't be allowed to purchase a gun. Thanks to the work of some of my colleagues in both Chambers, it also brings renewed attention to violence against Native American women who are so often overlooked.

I thank Senators SMITH, KLOBUCHAR, and CANTWELL for bringing attention to this bill later today.

Unfortunately, Leader MCCONNELL has indicated that he will not bring the House-passed VAWA bill to the floor, despite these many commonsense reforms. Why not? I hope it is not because the gun lobby reflexively opposes any restrictions on gun purchases—even for convicted stalkers. I hope that is not the impediment here, because as Senator KLOBUCHAR has pointed out, if you are abused by your husband, then, you are protected by VAWA. If you are abused by a boyfriend, you are not. What is the difference? What is the difference?

VAWA is yet another example of how Leader MCCONNELL has turned this Chamber into a legislative graveyard. Even the most commonsense bills, with broad support from one end of America to the other, that are passed by the House—here, a bill protecting women from violence—meet the grim fate at the hands of the Senate's self-proclaimed Grim Reaper.

What a shame. The Violence Against Women Act is precisely the kind of legislation the American people expect the Senate to consider. During a difficult few weeks for women across

America, the Senate could have sent a strong, positive signal by moving forward on the Violence Against Women Act. Instead, Leader McConnell carved out another tombstone for his legislative graveyard—another popular bipartisan bill buried with no action by the Senate and tied by the leader in partisan gridlock.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, earlier this month, a report from Hawaii's Mauna Loa Observatory found that carbon dioxide levels in our atmosphere have now reached the highest level in human history—in human history. It was a chilling reminder that the threat from climate change is real, immediate, and existential. Almost everyone accepts this science and the gravity of the threat it portends. The only group of folks that still seem skeptical of climate science are Republicans and the Trump administration.

Yesterday the New York Times reported that the Trump EPA is planning to rewrite the established benchmarks for unsafe levels of air pollution. You heard that right. They are planning to use dubious math to obscure the real and long-known health risks of air pollution. These new formulations would result in fewer predicted deaths than what the experts have long agreed to. People will still die. The numbers will just be wrong about the effect.

Why, might you ask, would anyone want to obscure the full health risks of air pollution? Because then the Trump administration could use the fake math to justify further rollbacks to clean air rules at a time when global warming is increasing and when Americans know the danger. This Trump administration and the Republican majority are rolling the clock back—more carbon, more coal, more oil, and more gas, when we need less. We all know that.

What kind of Orwellian nonsense is this? The Environmental Protection Agency making it easier to pollute the environment? It is a textbook definition of “dystopian.”

As my colleague Senator WHITEHOUSE so often points out, dark money lurks behind so much of what the Trump administration does. Big Oil, Big Gas, and big polluters everywhere are the only possible boosters of this decision. It is their money, funneled to political organizations and politicians without a trace of disclosure, that motivates folks in the Trump administration to make it easier to release more pollution into the air.

We should be using the Senate to debate climate policies in search of common ground, but Leader McConnell has decided to bring forward his version of the Green New Deal just so his party could vote against it. We know what Leader McConnell and the Republicans are against. What are they for in dealing with climate change? So far, nada, zero, nothing—they haven't

put a single thing on the floor. The American people see the effects of climate change in their lives, and they know Congress must act. Only the Republican majority stands in the way.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROMNEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Howard C. Nielson, of Utah, to be United States District Judge for the District of Utah.

MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, Monday is Memorial Day. It is the day our Nation pauses to remember all those who laid down their lives in defense of our country, from Saratoga to Yorktown, to Iraq and Afghanistan.

We enjoy tremendous freedoms as Americans, tremendous privileges, but we do not enjoy these privileges by chance. They are hard-fought gains secured for us again and again by each new generation of American soldiers who lay down their lives in the cause of the free. It is important that we do not take what they have secured for us lightly, that we remember our freedoms have been paid for in blood.

Near the end of the film “Saving Private Ryan,” the dying Captain Miller tells Private Ryan of the sacrifice that has been made on his behalf. He says: “Earn this . . . earn it.”

I am not sure we can ever fully earn the gift that has been given to us by those who have laid down their lives in our defense, but we can attempt to live lives worthy of their sacrifice and to defend the cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion.

When we remember the fallen on Memorial Day, there is one other group we should remember, and that is their

families. Our Nation's Gold Star families may not have laid down their own lives for our country, but they gave their loved ones, their fathers and brothers, daughters and sisters. For the sake of our freedoms, they live with empty spaces at Thanksgivings and birthdays, at weddings and graduations, at their dinner tables and Little League practices. We owe them a debt also that we can never repay.

I have been privileged to visit more than one veterans cemetery, such as our own Black Hills National Cemetery in South Dakota—which we recently expanded to ensure that our soldiers will have a resting place for generations to come—Arlington National Cemetery, and the American Cemetery at Normandy. There is a special hallowedness to the ground at these places. Valor and sacrifice still linger in the air, and a deep peace abounds—the peace of the warrior who has fought the good fight and found rest from his labors.

General George S. Patton once said:

It is foolish and wrong to mourn the men who died. Rather, we should thank God that such men lived.

I might disagree with General Patton on the first part, as it is right and proper that we should mourn our dead, but with General Patton, I say: Let us thank God that such men and women lived.

May the memory of our honored dead be eternal.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor again today to discuss Washington Democrats' one-size-fits-all healthcare scheme. Every American needs to know about this very radical plan.

Democrats essentially want Washington, DC, to take over all of healthcare in this country and to abolish private health insurance that 180 million Americans get through their jobs. Incredibly, this proposal offered by Senator BERNIE SANDERS has the backing of many leading Democrats running for President and 109 Democratic Members of the House of Representatives.

So I want to continue the debate today by focusing on the terrible impact this radical scheme will have on all of the fine men and women who provide healthcare to people across the country. Of course, the impact on them will impact the patients for whom they provide care and services.

I am talking about the Nation's dedicated medical professionals, especially

those who serve in our community hospitals. I actually know many of these healthcare providers because I am one of them. For many years I practiced orthopedic surgery in Casper, WY. I was a medical doctor, a physician, and chief of staff at the Wyoming Medical Center.

When practicing medicine in Casper, WY—or anywhere in the Presiding Officer's home State of Nebraska—you really treat patients from all over the State. That is because many people in Wyoming live in small towns. I am talking about patients in towns like my wife's hometown of Thermopolis, WY. My wife's parents are there. When they need specialty care, they go to Casper. For those who haven't traveled in Wyoming, it is about a 2-hour drive one way when the weather is good.

My point is, when you work in the Casper hospital, you are actually covering a large area in our State, and that is often the case in many States. So when I hear that Washington Democrats want to have a one-size-fits-all healthcare plan, I wonder if they have given any thought to people in the Nation's heartland, to people out west. Are they considering people in rural communities at all?

I will state that I think about the people of Wyoming every day. I am there every week. The staff at small hospitals who serve rural communities like Thermopolis, Rawlins, Lusk, Kemmerer, and at the Lovell hospital, where I attended a health fair this past Saturday, talking to all of the folks there—their needs are things I am not convinced Washington Democrats have any knowledge of or care for at all. The people at these hospitals work hard just to keep the doors open so that they can continue to care for patients right there.

So alarm bells go off when I see headlines like the one from the Washington Post that said:

"Who's going to take care of these people?" As emergencies rise across rural America, a hospital fights for its life.

That is the headline in the Washington Post, referring to a community hospital in Osage County, OK. The hospital has a sign out front that reads: "A small community is only as healthy as its hospital." That is the truth.

Hospitals across rural America are struggling. Many are, in fact, fighting for their lives. Still, Democrats are offering a plan that will destroy private health insurance in America, which is the lifeblood of our Nation's healthcare system; 180 million Americans get their insurance this way.

Democrats want to drastically reduce provider payments which, of course, would drive many doctors from practice and shutter many small hospitals. The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services Administrator has said a one-size-fits-all system "would decimate physician networks, creating a permanent physician shortage."

So how can rural hospitals survive with no financial cushion if Democrats'

one-size-fits-all healthcare plan passes? Just ask the New York Times, of all people. Last month, the Times ran with this headline: "Hospitals Stand to Lose Billions Under 'Medicare for All.'" Hospitals stand to lose billions.

The Times cites a study from George Mason University that found Medicare provider reimbursement rates are more than 40 percent lower than private insurance rates—40 percent lower. At these payment rates, the Times says, "[s]ome hospitals, especially struggling rural centers," like those in the Presiding Officer's home State and mine "would close virtually overnight."

There would be an overnight closure of hospitals under BERNIE SANDERS' and the Democrats' one-size-fits-all scheme for medicine in America.

I am sure a lot of people listening out there are thinking, maybe it is all a mistake; maybe Democrats don't really mean to threaten hospitals. Well, the fact is, Democrats have long argued that hospitals need to close. That is what they have said.

Look at what Dr. Ezekiel Emanuel, who is an architect of ObamaCare and a professor in Philadelphia, said on the subject. He actually wrote a book outlining all of this. It is titled, "Reinventing American Health Care."

He predicted that 1,000 U.S. hospitals would close by 2020. Well, we are approaching that year. We haven't closed 1,000 in this country, but over 80 have closed, and those are rural hospitals.

Last year he published an op-ed in the New York Times—the same Dr. Emanuel—ominously titled, "Are Hospitals Becoming Obsolete?" He writes:

Hospitals are disappearing. While they will never completely go away, they will continue to shrink in number and importance. This is inevitable and good.

Well, not in rural America—"good," he says, that thousands of hospitals and patients who rely on them are forced to close their doors for good. I disagree fundamentally with this principle and what he is saying.

Of course, all people who practice medicine in small towns want to keep the doors open because they know the impact on the lives of the people who live in those communities. Just last week I had a chance to visit with Dr. Mike Tracy, a family physician in Powell, WY. He is past president of the Wyoming Medical Society. He is passionate about caring for his patients, and guess what. He doesn't participate in Medicare at all. Instead, he provides his services privately by charging his patients a set, transparent monthly fee. He does what he does to keep his practice open. His focus is on his patients, not on Washington paperwork, and his patients are very happy. His practice is successful. The patients are happy with the time he is able to sit and be with them and look at them and focus on them, instead of the mandates of a Washington computer screen.

So you see, there are doctors like Mike all across the country who don't

want a one-size-fits-all healthcare system. Many doctors and many small community hospitals cannot afford it, and they will not survive it. Certainly, many rural communities can't survive it.

As the Presiding Officer knows better than most, as he has traveled his State and as I have traveled mine, if a small community loses a hospital, it is harder to attract doctors, nurses, teachers, businesses—all of the things that are vital for a community to have. So the threat is very real in terms of what the Democrats and what BERNIE SANDERS and the one-size-fits-all healthcare plan would bring to our country.

Let me just tell people who are watching the debate right now: Democrats' one-size-fits-all healthcare—what this will mean for you is that you will pay more to wait longer for worse care. That is what it means. That is what it means to you. You will pay more to wait longer for worse care. That is what is at stake.

We all need to make our voices heard loud and clear: no to Democrats' one-size-fits-all healthcare scheme, yes to real reforms that improve healthcare and bring down the costs for all Americans.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENERGY INNOVATION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, it seems a bit surreal but necessary, nonetheless, to come here to the Senate floor to talk about the perils of socialism and its sudden resurgence within the Democratic Party.

We have seen our Democratic friends push for policies like Medicare for All, which would completely wreck the system that provides healthcare for our seniors and force all Americans onto the same plan, regardless of the fact that they never paid anything into it, like our seniors have, and regardless of the fact that they may indeed like their private health insurance that they get from their employers.

Do you remember when the Obama administration promised in 2013, "If you like your plan, you can keep it"? Well, I don't really think they meant it, but that is at least what they said. Democrats have gotten so much more radical today that their motto should be, "If you like your plan, you can't keep it under Medicare for All."

They have also promised things like free college—and, believe me, "free" is popular, especially if you don't think you are ever going to have to end up paying for it—promising anyone and everyone that they can go to college for free.

Now, there are some smart things we can do to help prepare high school students and college students to hold down their debt and to make sure that they get the sort of advice and counseling they need to make sure they are studying something that is going to be able to provide them an income with which they can repay the loans that they take out, and there is some work we need to do in that area.

Across Texas, I have had a chance recently to go to a number of middle schools and high schools, and in Texas—and I am sure we are not alone—there are many high schools where students can get dual credit, college and high school credit, and some of them graduate from high school with essentially 2 years of college behind them, and it costs them nothing. It is free. I guess that is free. Actually, it is not free, either, but they don't have to pay anything more for it, and their parents don't have to pay anything more for their property or sales tax for it.

So that is a smarter way to approach this, rather than this radical idea that things like college can somehow be free, knowing that, actually, there will be somebody that pays for it, whether it is our children, when they grow up and they have to pay back the money that we have recklessly borrowed in our deficits and debt, or by raising taxes, and you can't raise taxes enough on the rich people in order to pay for this. So, inevitably, that burden will fall on the middle class.

To put the icing on the cake on these radical policies, you have to look at this Green New Deal proposal that the Democrats have rolled out and really call this the icing on the cake in their socialist proposals.

They want to take over the entire energy sector of the economy, and they want to regulate it, and they want to tax it in such a way as to promise somehow something that is never going to be realized.

For example, they say they want to achieve net zero emissions in 10 years. Well, Texas, Oklahoma, and other States generate a lot of electricity from renewable sources, particularly wind-generated energy, but there is no way in the world you are going to be able to eliminate things like natural gas and other sources of energy because the wind doesn't always blow and the Sun doesn't always shine. So you are going to need something to provide the baseload when the wind is not blowing and the Sun is not shining. This pie-in-the-sky idea of net zero emissions in 10 years by going entirely to renewables is simply fantasy.

They also want to overhaul our transportation system. They want to rebuild and retrofit every single building in the country, but they offer no real details, and, in fact, I think there is a reason for that, because they don't even talk about the details of what needs to be accomplished or the cost there would be associated with trying to accomplish it.

The only estimate I have seen is a \$93 trillion price tag, but that is an important piece of information that you would think the public would have a right to know, and that is not something the advocates of the Green New Deal have been particularly proud of.

Even if this is something a majority of Americans want, we don't currently have the technology or the resources to make it happen. Our Democratic friends know that. So they are, in essence, making a promise for something that they can't deliver because of the price and because the technology has not yet been invented.

So what was really bizarre here on the Senate floor was that when the majority leader provided our Democratic colleagues a chance to vote on this resolution on the Senate floor, not a single Democratic colleague voted for it. They voted "present."

Well, that is a new one on me. I thought when we came here to the Senate, our job was to represent our constituents and vote yes or no on legislation. To show up and vote "present" seems to me like an abdication of that responsibility, but it also is some evidence of how really cynical and insincere this proposal really is.

That is not to say that it isn't popular when you start offering free things and you start promising things that are unaffordable or unattainable.

Instead of talking about these policies that are unwanted, unachievable, and unaffordable, let's talk about some real solutions. I think that is the responsibility of people like me who say the Green New Deal will not cut it, to which people might ask: Well, what are your suggestions? And I think that is an important and fair question.

No matter what your perspective on energy issues and the environment, I think every single one of us can agree on at least one point: We need smart energy policies that will strengthen our economy without bankrupting American families.

I would just note, parenthetically, that we have actually made some pretty good progress when it comes to emissions control. Between 1970 and 2017, combined U.S. emissions of six criteria air pollutants have gone down 73 percent. During that same period of time, the American economy grew by 262 percent, the number of vehicle miles traveled grew 189 percent, and our population grew 59 percent. We were able to reduce pollutants by 73 percent at a time when the population was growing, people were driving more, and our economy was growing.

More recently, between 1990 and 2017, the United States reduced sulfur dioxide concentrations by 88 percent, lead by 80 percent, nitrogen dioxide by 50 percent, particulate matter by 40 percent, ground-level ozone by 22 percent, and carbon monoxide by 77 percent.

From 2005 to 2017, carbon dioxide emissions declined nearly 15 percent in the United States. During that same period of time—and this is a fair com-

parison—China's annual carbon dioxide emissions have increased roughly by double—twice what they were during the same time period.

So I would say that we can blame America first for all sorts of problems. I don't think that is fair, nor is it accurate, and, particularly, when you start talking about the environment and controlling ozone-depleting CO₂ emissions. I think there is a better way to approach it, and we need to start with the facts.

I think the facts are that we need to form partnerships to leverage the capabilities of the private sector and achieve cost-effective solutions. None of the people advocating the Green New Deal can really tell you how much you would be paying for electricity if we were able to implement the Green New Deal, how much you would have to pay for your transportation costs, or how much you would have to pay to heat or cool your house. We need policies that make sense, that are affordable and achievable, and that will actually bring down the cost of each of those items for the American people.

The solution isn't a \$100 trillion Green New Deal; it is good old-fashioned, all-American innovation. By incentivizing research into the development of new technologies, we can keep costs low for taxpayers, while securing our place as a global leader in energy innovation. One great example of the type of solution I am suggesting you could learn about by taking a trip to the NET Power plant in La Porte, TX, right outside of Houston, which I did recently. NET Power has developed a first-of-its-kind power system that generates affordable, zero-emissions electricity using their unique carbon capture technology. They have taken natural gas—one of the most prevalent and affordable energy sources that there is—and they have made it emission-free. This is a shining example of the environmentally and fiscally responsible policies we should be advocating and supporting.

Last year, renewables accounted for only 17 percent of our total energy sources. That includes hydropower, wind, solar, biomass, and various other sources. Seventeen percent. Natural gas already accounts for more than double that. So if we could take this incredibly common and affordable energy source and make it more environmentally friendly, why wouldn't we do that? Why wouldn't that be a more sensible, fiscally responsible way of addressing this?

These policies are important for conservation but also for securing our competitiveness on the world stage. If American companies don't produce these technologies first, well, you bet somebody else will.

The heavyhanded government approaches we are seeing from our Democratic colleagues are not the answer. Instead, we have to harness the power of the private sector and build partnerships to drive real solutions.

Yes, we need to invest in innovative solutions and encourage the private sector to continue prioritizing reliable, affordable, and environmentally sound energy sources.

When you implement government policies that get government out of the way and let the experts do their jobs, you can be pro-energy, pro-innovation, pro-growth, and pro-environment. I will soon be introducing some legislation that I think will help us move down that road. We know the United States leads the world in emissions reduction, and this bill will build on that success without a one-size-fits-all mandate that would bankrupt our country.

DEBBIE SMITH ACT

Mr. President, on another topic, as I highlighted earlier this week, the Senate has unanimously passed the Debbie Smith Act of 2019, which would provide critical resources for law enforcement to test rape kits, prosecute criminals, and deliver justice for victims. This was a major bipartisan achievement, and I look forward to working with our House colleagues to get this legislation to the President's desk as soon as possible.

But there is more we need to do to assist victims of violence and sexual assault. For example, today I am filing the Help End Abusive Living Situations—or HEALS—Act, which will provide domestic violence survivors with expanded access to transitional housing. This will help these victims permanently leave their abusers, rebuild their lives, and begin a long-term healing process.

Even more pressing, folks on both sides of the aisle agree that we need to reauthorize and strengthen the Violence Against Women Act, also known as VAWA. It is something I strongly support and an issue our friend and colleague Senator ERNST continues to champion here in the Senate.

Republicans and Democrats say we must do more to provide services for victims of domestic violence and sexual assault, and while we certainly had some disagreements on the way to do that, there is no question that VAWA has traditionally been a bipartisan commitment. That is why I was so shocked earlier this year when House Democrats blocked the Republican effort to reauthorize this critical law before it lapsed last February.

The current violence against women law lapsed in February because House Democrats refused to allow us to extend it. Why would they do that? If they claim to be supportive of efforts to protect women and others from violence and assault, why would they let the very law that authorizes the various programs Congress has paid for in the past—why would they let that lapse? Well, sadly, this is where politics rears its ugly head.

We were seeking a short-term reauthorization of the existing Violence Against Women Act so bipartisan negotiations could continue on a long-term update and extension of the law, but

House Democrats recklessly blocked this reauthorization of VAWA because they were seeking to add controversial provisions that should never be a part of a consensus bill—certainly not one that enjoys broad bipartisan support.

In the face of this political jockeying by House Democrats, I am proud to say that the Appropriations Committee did the right thing: It continued to fully fund all Violence Against Women Act programs through the remainder of this fiscal year. So this means that House Democrats, when they tried to kill VAWA by refusing to reauthorize it, actually failed to accomplish their goal if their goal was to deny women and other victims of violence the critical funding needed for these programs.

Despite the efforts they undertook to let VAWA expire, critical domestic violence and sexual assault prevention programs will continue to receive full Federal funding until we can reach a bipartisan consensus agreement and update the law. So good for the Appropriations Committee for making that happen, but my point is that VAWA should never be used as a political plaything or pawn.

I am somewhat encouraged by ongoing, bipartisan negotiations here in the Senate, and I commend Senator ERNST for her commitment to this effort and look forward to supporting a long-term extension of VAWA that is done in the right way—through negotiation and agreement, not political gamesmanship. That is the wrong way to do things. We know better—if people will simply stop the political posturing and political games and do the work the American people sent us here to do.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am here to discuss with my colleagues issues dealing with the work of the Senate Finance Committee and possible legislation that hopefully will come up this summer to keep healthcare costs down, particularly prescription drugs.

In the process of doing that, I want to set the record straight on an issue that affects every American who is eligible for Medicare. More specifically, I am here to talk about efforts to reduce the rising cost of prescription medicine.

Prescription drugs save lives. Millions of Americans like myself wake up every morning and take their daily medication, but there is something that has become a very tough pill to swallow for an increasing number of Americans, and that is paying for the rising cost of prescription drugs.

I applaud President Trump for turning up the volume on this issue last summer. That is when the President announced his administration's blueprint to lower drug costs for all Americans. He found out—and we all found out—that is a goal that has widespread support that includes Republicans and Democrats, as well as urban and rural Americans.

Of course, the President can only do so much—whatever law passed by Congress allows the President to do and that doesn't solve all the issues. So even though I applaud the President, that doesn't mean I exclude in any way the responsibility of Congress to take action.

There are many good ideas to build upon that share broad, bipartisan, bicameral support. There is one policy, however, that some Members are talking about that I don't agree with, and that is repealing what is the noninterference clause in Medicare Part D. I would like to explain why Congress kept the government out of the business of negotiating drug prices in the Medicare program. Some 16 years ago, when I was formerly chairman of the Finance Committee, I was a principal architect of the Medicare Part D program.

For the first time ever, Congress, in 2003, added an outpatient prescription drug benefit to the Medicare program. Maybe I ought to explain for my colleagues why it took between 1965 and 2003 to include drug benefits in the Medicare program. Remember, in 1965, prescription drugs or drugs generally didn't play a very big role in the delivery of medicine like they do today, but over time, they have become more important.

That is why great support at the grassroots, both bipartisan and bicameral, evolved into what we call the Medicare Part D program, adopted in that year, 2003. So we came to the conclusion that adding the prescription drug benefits for seniors was the right thing to do, but it needed to be done in the right way—right for seniors and right for the American taxpayers. By that, I mean allowing the forces of free enterprise and competition to drive costs down and drive value up.

For the first time ever, Medicare recipients in every State had the voluntary decision to choose a prescription drug plan that fit their pocketbooks and their healthcare needs.

The Part D program has worked. Beneficiary enrollment and satisfaction are robust. The Part D marketplace offers consumers better choice, better coverage, and better value; yet here we are again. It has been 13 years since Part D was implemented, and once again, I am hearing the same calls to put the government back into the driver's seat of making decisions on what you can take in the way of pills or what your doctor might be able to prescribe to you based upon what a formulary might be. We want the private sector to decide the formulary, not the

government. So these people happen to be the same backseat drivers who think that centralized government knows everything and knows best.

As the Senator who, once again, chairs the committee with jurisdiction over Medicare policy, I am not going to let Congress unravel what is right about Medicare Part D. Remember, I was a Republican leading the charge to add a new benefit to a government program. A lot of people think that is very uncharacteristic of a Republican, but I told you why I did that: because medicine was becoming an increasing part of the delivery of quality healthcare. So you heard me correctly, I was a Republican chairman working with my Democratic ranking member, Max Baucus, to accomplish Part D. We negotiated an agreement to add prescription drug coverage for seniors.

For me and other Republicans—namely President George W. Bush—there were a few key caveats. First, it must be voluntary. Second, beneficiaries would share the cost with the taxpayer because having skin in the game keeps check on spending and on utilization. Third, we must allow competition—not government mandates—to drive innovation, curb costs, expand coverage, and improve outcomes. It wouldn't work if the Federal Government interfered with delivery of medicine and dictate which drugs would and would not be covered. That is why we wrote a noninterference clause in the law.

My friend, Senator WYDEN, the current Democratic ranking member of the Finance Committee, voted for final passage in 2003. By the way, we are having very good bipartisan cooperation in our Finance Committee on, hopefully, legislation to be debated in our committee in June in regard to lowering drug costs.

The noninterference provision expressly prohibits Medicare from, one, negotiating drug prices; two, setting drug prices; and, three, establishing a one-size-fits-all list of covered drugs. That list is called a formulary. I remember that many of my friends on the other side of the aisle voted for this policy; yet some are now pushing for repeal of that provision.

Here is a list of Democrat leaders who supported and voted to ban Medicare from negotiating drug prices: when he was in the Senate, Senator Biden; Senator Kennedy; Senator Baucus; Senator Reid, the former majority leader; Senator SCHUMER now in the Senate; LEAHY; DURBIN; STABENOW; CANTWELL. On the other side of the Capitol, the list included Speaker PELOSI and chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Chairman NEAL.

There is something else that I have learned in all my years talking healthcare policy with Iowans at my annual 99 county meetings where I enjoy a Q and A with whatever agenda my constituents call upon me to discuss with them.

At the end of the day, Iowans don't want the government prescribing life-

saving medications. Iowans want to make those decisions with a physician who is treating them. Last year, 43 million out of 60 million Medicare recipients were enrolled in the Medicare Part D program. That is the vast majority of Medicare beneficiaries nationwide that don't have coverage through a past employer or similar coverage from another source.

Plan sponsors design different plan choices and compete for beneficiaries based on what those plans cover and what they cost. Beneficiaries can pick from many options, with over 3,000 plans offered across 34 geographic areas. In other words, you don't have one plan dictated by the government. Most beneficiaries were covered by a prescription drug plan, and a growing number were covered by a Medicare advantage prescription drug plan.

The Part D base premium amount is low and has remained stable over many years. Looking back to our negotiations in 2003 to get this bill to the President of the United States, we wondered how high these premiums would go, and we were fearful they would just go out of the atmosphere and that they would not be stable like they have been over a long period of time. So the noninterference clause ensures that plan sponsors create plan options that respond to what the beneficiaries—not the government—says it should be.

The nonpartisan congressional scorekeeper, the Congressional Budget Office, has repeatedly stated that repealing this noninterference clause would not save money, unless there was a restricted formulary. As I stated, we wrote this bill in 2003 so the government wouldn't get between you and your doctor on what you ought to have in the way of prescription drugs. So in regard to the cost, I asked CBO to update, and they did. CBO sent me a letter stating the same thing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the May 10, 2019, letter from the CBO.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
Washington, DC, May 10, 2019.

KEITH HALL, Ph.D.,
Director, Congressional Budget Office,
U.S. Congress, Washington, DC.

DEAR DR. HALL: As an author of the Medicare Part D program enacted in the Medicare Modernization Act of 2003, I support the statutory provision that prohibits the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) from interfering with negotiations between drug manufacturers, pharmacies, and plan sponsors. The Part D program structure that uses private entities to negotiate and compete to enroll beneficiaries has worked. Program spending has been lower than estimated at the time the program was enacted. Beneficiary enrollment has been robust, and enrollee premiums have remained low and stable. Enrollees are largely satisfied with their plan. The statutory "non-interference" clause is a key reason for the program's success.

While the Part D program has provided beneficiaries with a crucial lifeline through access to prescription medications, improvements are needed to lower high out-of-pocket costs and to realize better value for the taxpayer-supported Medicare program. Some have suggested that allowing the Secretary to negotiate for the price of drugs will achieve those aims. I believe that talk of eliminating the non-interference clause is misguided and counterproductive. I ask that you answer the questions below as to inform the policy debate on this matter.

If the Secretary was given authority to negotiate by Congress and used that authority, would it be possible to obtain savings in Medicare?

Could negotiating by the Secretary over drug prices obtain savings for the Medicare program if those negotiations were limited to selective instances?

Thank you for your attention to the Part D program that has benefited millions of Medicare beneficiaries. Please contact my staff if you have questions.

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. GRASSLEY,
Chairman.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
U.S. CONGRESS,
Washington, DC, May 17, 2019.

Re: Negotiation Over Drug Prices in Medicare.

Hon. CHUCK GRASSLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: You asked for updated answers to two questions that CBO addressed in a letter to Senator Wyden in 2007. Those questions relate to the Medicare Part D prescription drug benefit and options for allowing the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate over the prices paid for drugs under that benefit. Under current law, the Secretary is prohibited both from interfering in the negotiations between drug manufacturers and the prescription drug plans (PDPs) that deliver the Medicare benefit and from requiring a particular formulary or instituting a price structure for the reimbursement of covered drugs.

The questions and the key conclusions from CBO's response in 2007 are below. CBO continues to stand by those conclusions.

If the Secretary was given authority to negotiate by Congress and used that authority, would it be possible to obtain savings in Medicare?

The key factor in determining whether negotiations would lead to price reductions is the leverage that the Secretary would have to secure larger price concessions from drug manufacturers than competing PDPs currently obtain. Negotiation is likely to be effective only if it is accompanied by some source of pressure on drug manufacturers to secure price concessions. For example, authority to establish a formulary could be a source of pressure. In the absence of such pressure, the Secretary's ability to issue credible threats or take other actions in an effort to obtain significant discounts would be limited. Thus, CBO concluded that providing broad negotiating authority by itself would likely have a negligible effect on federal spending.

Could negotiating by the Secretary over drug prices obtain savings for the Medicare program if those negotiations were limited to selective instances?

The authority to engage in negotiations limited to a few selected drugs or types of drugs under exceptional circumstances could potentially generate cost savings. For example, negotiations could be focused on drugs with no close substitutes or those with relatively high prices under Medicare that are needed to address a public health emergency.

In such cases, CBO expects that the effect of the Secretary's actions—if he or she took advantage of the new authority—would primarily reflect the use of the “bully pulpit” to pressure drug manufacturers into reducing prices. Thus, CBO concluded that the overall impact on federal spending from negotiations targeted at selected drugs would be modest. Beyond that general conclusion, the precise effect of any specific proposal would depend importantly on its details.

If you would like further information on this subject, we would be happy to provide it. The CBO staff contact is Tom Bradley.

Sincerely,

KEITH HALL,
Director.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, repealing the noninterference clause means a restricted formulary, which places limits on the drugs that are available to seniors, maybe excluding some drugs that your doctor wants to prescribe for you. I don't believe that Medicare beneficiaries want the government interfering in that process.

Then, as policymakers, we must keep in mind that we are making decisions that affect healthcare choices for the people whom we are elected to represent.

Let's all remember to first do no harm. Repealing the noninterference clause may sound good, but not even a spoonful of sugar will help that bad dose of policy medicine go down.

I come to the floor today to hope that I can put this issue to rest and, as we try to work in a bicameral and bipartisan way to reduce drug costs, that we don't get held up by people who want to do something different by having the government more involved, when it isn't going to save any money and will restrict formularies. It will get the government between you and your doctor.

In other words, I am trying to save Part D. It has been a great success. It is accepted by the people. Let's keep drug costs down without having this issue interfere with our process.

We need to preserve the foundation of private enterprise on which Part D is based—in other words, the marketplace working. We need to get to the real work of reducing prescription drug costs.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROMNEY). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FLOODING IN OKLAHOMA

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, just to give the Senate body a quick update of what is happening in my State right now, we have had some pretty dramatic flooding and over 15 tornadoes in the last 48 hours across the State. Thankfully, most of those tornadoes hit in open areas. They did not hit structures. There have been some

structures that have been damaged, but the flooding has been far worse than the tornadoes and the high winds.

Just 2 nights ago, in one of our counties, Osage County, we had severe flash flooding, where from 10 p.m. to 2:30 in the morning, over 100 different homes had to be evacuated in the middle of the night. Many of those folks had law enforcement, firefighters, and first responders arriving at their home with a boat or with a truck to get them out, literally, in their pajamas so they could escape. Many of those homes have 4 to 6 feet of water in them now.

It has been intense for those folks who are in the area. In fact, it is interesting. The director of emergency management for that area spent the entire night saving homes and helping people get out. When dawn broke and they knew they had gotten everyone out, he headed back to his own house only to find out he could no longer get to his home anymore because of the floodwaters.

We have had folks all over the State, whether that be in Perry, where we had two homes that were destroyed in a tornado that night that, thankfully, did not hit the center of town. We had other spots, like around Eufaula, where we had some serious flooding; Stillwater, where there has been flooding. In Dale we had a very dangerous overnight tornado that came in, literally, while everyone was sleeping. There are pockets of folks who are there who have been affected by this, literally, all over the State.

For the department of transportation folks, for the folks in our police and fire departments, for the emergency management individuals—both for the State and the counties—for mayors and city managers, for hospitals, for county workers, for city staff, for the Corps of Engineers, and, quite frankly, for just neighbors down the street, it has been a long week. There have been a lot of folks serving each other to take care of those needs, and there will be for a while.

I thought this body would need a quick update because sometimes people feel a long way from the center of the country when you are in Washington, DC, but we need to understand what is happening in the center of the country right now—literally, the center of America. It is affecting all Americans.

TULSA RACE RIOT ANNIVERSARY

Mr. President, I did want to tell a story, though. It is a little bit of a different story. It is about 9,000 people in Tulsa who were suddenly left homeless. It wasn't this week, and it wasn't a natural disaster. It was actually on June 1, 1921, when the worst race riot/massacre happened in American history. That story is still one that this body needs to remember.

I brought this up a few years ago, and I thought it may be time to bring it up again. The reason is that we are quickly approaching the 100-year anniversary of a whole series of riots that happened around America in the summer of 1919.

As the soldiers were coming back home from World War I, many of whom were African-American soldiers who had served with great dignity and honor there, they returned back home with skills that they had picked up overseas and with a tenacious patriotism and work ethic. They returned back to America to go back to work, but they were greeted by a lot of White business owners and a lot of White workers in the country who said: You may have served overseas and fought the war, but you are not welcome to work here. And White neighbors started setting homes and cities on fire.

There were riots. There were protests. There was a national pushback that happened in the summer of 1919. Chicago and Washington, DC, were some of the worst. Oklahoma really survived it well.

Interestingly enough, in Oklahoma, we have 30 towns that were considered Black towns, scattered all across the State. The first folks who actually came to Oklahoma who were African American actually came with the five Tribes when they were relocated. They were brought by the five Tribes who had held them as slaves. When they moved from the southeastern part of the country, and they moved to Eastern Oklahoma and were relocated there in that tragic walk, they brought their slaves with them.

In the land rush after 1889 and then years later as we became a State, land started opening up and individuals and families who were African Americans moved from all over the country coming for new hope and opportunity. There were 30 different towns that sprung up all over Oklahoma that were predominantly African-American towns. One of those was Greenwood.

At that time, it was affectionately known as “Black Wall Street.” It was one of the most prosperous African-American communities in the entire country. It was right on the north end of Tulsa.

Although, when they left from Greenwood and came into Tulsa to work, to shop, or whatever it may be, they were limited. In Greenwood, there were shops, stores, movie theaters, lawyers, doctors, and all kinds of activities. Everything was there. But if they walked a few blocks from Greenwood into Tulsa, they found themselves not being welcomed.

In fact, in downtown Tulsa, there was only one place where a Black man could actually go to the bathroom—one. It was in that building that a gentleman named Dick Rowland took the elevator up to go to the bathroom. On the elevator, there was a White girl there named Sarah Page.

We have no idea what happened in that elevator, but when the elevator door opened, she screamed, and a crowd quickly grabbed Dick Rowland and pulled him off, accusing him of all kinds of things, and hauled him off to jail in downtown Tulsa, where, within a few hours, a lynch mob gathered around that jail.

To their credit, law enforcement in Tulsa went out to the streets and said: You all go home. But they did not. The mob stayed there.

Soldiers who had served faithfully in World War I, who were African Americans, who lived in Greenwood, picked up their rifles and gathered together to go in and support law enforcement who was at the jail in downtown Tulsa to protect Dick Rowland.

As they marched down to go help, the law enforcement there apparently said: You all leave as well. We have got this handled.

But as they left, there was a scuffle in the street, and a shot was fired. We have no idea how it happened or which happened first. The news never reported that. But we know that those groups of African-American men left and ran back to Greenwood, and the mob followed them. They marched their way to Greenwood, and they burned it down, destroying Greenwood and wiping out that city.

That night, all night long—May 31 into June 1—America experienced one of its darkest moments. There were 1,200 homes destroyed that night in Greenwood. There were 9,000 people who were left homeless. There were 6,000 African Americans who were rounded up by the police in Tulsa and jailed “for their protection.” They were the ones who were held, not the rioters who actually caused the massacre.

The numbers are all over the place of how many people actually died that night. There are numbers as small as 35 and as large as 300. We will never know. But let’s just say there were many—very likely, hundreds of people—who died that night. One-third of the people were gone, and we have no idea what direction they went. One-third of the people packed up and moved and left, and one-third of the folks stayed. But interestingly enough, that Sunday, after the fire, after the riots, after the destruction and after Greenwood was left leveled, folks from Greenwood gathered that Sunday for worship.

Dr. Olivia Hooker passed away just this last November. She was one of the last survivors of the Tulsa Race Massacre. In an interview shortly before she passed away, she told the story of hearing the men with axes destroy her sister’s piano during the riot. With her three siblings, she hid under a table as her home was literally destroyed around her.

You would think that devastation would be the end of her story. It was not. In World War II, she became the first African American to join the Coast Guard. She earned degrees from two universities and ended up being a professor at Fordham University. That is tenacious resilience.

She reminds me of my modern-day friend Donna Jackson. In 2013, Donna Jackson determined that North Tulsa in Greenwood was known for its entrepreneurship. That is why it got the name “Black Wall Street.” In 2013, she

determined that she was going to challenge 100 new businesses to start in Greenwood, to bring life back to that area again with business and entrepreneurship. For its 100th anniversary, there would be 100 new businesses.

Donna lives and breathes Greenwood. She was born in Morton Memorial. She goes to church in North Tulsa, she works in North Tulsa, and she believes in North Tulsa’s future, as do I. She is going to make her goal of 100 new businesses there. She is doing the work to help introduce people to North Tulsa and to be engaged. There are companies that are from outside the area that are coming in, such as the new QT that just opened there. There are lots of individual businesses that continue to start and thrive again in North Tulsa.

North Tulsa is a place where we should practice basic reconciliation, where America should stop and look again and say “What can be done, and what have we done?” and fix it.

Josh Jacobs was born in North Tulsa in 1998 and graduated from high school in North Tulsa. He ended up making a very bad decision. He left North Tulsa to go play football for the University of Alabama—clearly a terrible decision. Josh ended up being drafted 24th overall by the Oakland Raiders last year. He is a tremendous, shining example of somebody who grew up in North Tulsa and is representing us well.

His dad made an interesting statement. He said that as Josh was growing up, he was a great athlete. He could have traveled anywhere in the area to play football in high school. He chose to stay there on the north side. He said: “This is the north side. Why not build up our side of town? Why take off and leave?”

You would be pleased to know that Josh has on his own Twitter account “2 Peter 3:9.” That is what is pinned at the top.

The Lord is not slow in doing what he promised, the way some people understand slowness. But God is being patient with you. He does not want anyone to be lost, but he wants all people to change their hearts and their lives.

That is a pretty good message, Josh.

I believe we are still a nation of reconciliation. The first step in reconciliation is not forgetting who we were and who we have been as a nation and to make sure we take the steps necessary to resolve broken relationships.

There is not a law we can pass in this body that will solve the race issue. There are ways we can protect and make sure every person has every opportunity, whether it be in housing, employment, or whatever it may be. Race is not a political issue; race is a heart issue. The primary issue with race begins in your own heart and in your own family.

Several years ago, I started asking a very simple question of folks in Oklahoma. I asked that same question of people here. “Has your family ever invited a family of another race to your

home for dinner?” Interestingly enough, the response I get back from most people when I ask that is, they will smile at me and say “I have friends of another race,” to which I will smile at them and say “That is not what I asked. I asked, has your family ever invited a family of another race to your home for dinner?”

Being able to have real dialogue so that your kids can sit with kids of another race and can watch you interact as a parent with people from another race and see that it is normal conversation—our kids believe only what they see, and if they never see someone from another race in our home, they just assume we don’t have friends of another race.

I like to say we will never get all the issues about race on the table until we get our feet under the same table and start talking this out as friends. Reconciliation is not something we can legislate; reconciliation is something we do, it is who we are, and it comes about by action.

Next week, folks will gather in Tulsa, OK, again to recognize that 98 years ago, the city was on fire, and most of the White community looked away while Greenwood burned to the ground. Two years from now, the entire country will probably pause for 24 hours and will look at Tulsa and will ask a simple question: What has changed in 100 years? It is a fair question. I think Tulsa will stand up and say: We will not just show you the structures that it changed, but we will show you the hearts that it changed.

Tulsa is a very different community now. We still have a ways to go, as does the rest of the State, but we are making tremendous progress. While much of the world ignores race and chooses never to deal with race, we as Americans embrace each other and say: What do we have to do to restore what is broken and to make sure we see each other as friends and neighbors again? We are doing it differently, and that is a great benefit to us.

Mount Zion Baptist Church was founded in 1909 by Rev. Sandy Lyons. It was originally just a one-room schoolhouse. In 1916, the church began a \$92,000 endeavor, which I can assure you was a lot of money in 1916. They took out a \$50,000 loan to build a new church. Construction was completed in early 1921. On April 4, 1921, they held their first service, and on June 1 of that same year, a riot burned it to the ground. Worse yet, the White insurance company refused to pay their insurance, saying it was their fault that the riot happened.

That congregation could have been bitter; instead, they stayed put, and they rebuilt that church. They first paid off the mortgage for what had been burned to the ground, and then they rebuilt the church in that same location.

Vernon AME Church still stands in the same spot. The only thing left of that building was the basement, but

they rebuilt, by 1928, right on that same spot.

Dr. Turner there is a friend and is a pastor there. He made this statement:

I'm humbled every day to walk through a place that has seen so much terror but has also been a vessel of hope for so many people. After the massacre, people who lost their homes and their belongings still went to church on Sunday morning.

Believing in a God of reconciliation, whom I still believe in today, let's continue to get better, but let's not forget where we came from so it never ever happens again.

As we think about the summer of 1919, when the Nation was on fire from so many riots around the country, let's continue to finish what has begun in our hearts until that is complete.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

ABORTION

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise to express my deep concern over the constant attacks on women's health we are seeing all across America. From this administration's policies, to Donald Trump's judicial nominees, to Governors and legislators in States like Alabama, Georgia, and Missouri under Republican leadership—they are denying women their constitutional right to make their own personal and healthcare decisions.

Women and their healthcare should not be under constant threat. We as a nation have made great efforts to promote equal rights for women and men. In this Congress, we will celebrate the 100th anniversary of women's suffrage. It took a long time for women to get the right to vote, and we continue to make progress on equality. Yet, in the 21st century, the Trump administration continues to push and adopt policies that are setting this country and women in a wrong direction.

The Supreme Court made it clear in *Griswold v. Connecticut* and *Roe v. Wade* that there is a constitutional right to privacy that includes making healthcare decisions such as the use of contraception and the right to access abortion.

Through advancements in women's health and access to contraception and education, the number of unintended pregnancies has significantly been reduced, with a corresponding reduction in abortion. Yet we see Republican leaders trying to reverse the advancements our Nation has made in women's health, access to contraception, and education.

For nearly 50 years, the Supreme Court has upheld the legal precedent of *Roe v. Wade*, including its affirmation in *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* in 1992. In that case, the Supreme Court held that "our law affords constitutional protection to personal decisions relating to marriage . . . contraception, family relationships, child rearing, and education. . . . These matters, involving the most intimate and personal choices a person may make in a life-

time, choices central to personal dignity and autonomy, are central to the liberty protected by the Fourteenth Amendment."

The Court prohibited States from passing statutes that placed undue burdens on a woman's right to make her own healthcare decisions. Yet Republican leaders continue to introduce and pass laws that interfere with a woman's autonomy over her health and well-being.

Last week, for instance, the Republican Governor of Alabama signed a bill into law banning almost all abortions in that State, with no exceptions for the cases of rape or incest. The law not only prosecutes women, but it also includes unprecedented criminal penalties against doctors, threatening them with life in prison for treating women. The Alabama law exposes doctors to felony charges punishable by up to 99 years in prison for providing or attempting to provide an abortion, making this the most extreme ban of its kind to pass in nearly 30 years.

Since the beginning of 2019, bills attempting to restrict abortion have been filed in 45 States, including Alabama, Missouri, and Georgia.

Earlier this year, Georgia's Republican Governor signed a 6-week ban into law that would make it illegal for women to terminate a pregnancy and a doctor to perform the termination after a fetal heartbeat is detected. I must tell you, many women don't even realize they are pregnant at 6 weeks.

The Alabama and Georgia bills impose burdensome and medically unnecessary limitations on women and their doctors, particularly those in low-income, medically underserved areas. The bills harm women who are victims of sexual assault and minors who are victims of incest. These provisions appear to be designed to perpetrate a culture of not believing women and trying to discredit the victims of assault.

It is hard to understand how many Republicans are talking about getting Big Government out of people's lives but not when it comes to one of the hardest and most intimate decisions a woman can make—a decision that she wishes to make between herself and her doctor. In those circumstances, these same colleagues believe that Big Government, and not the woman herself, knows better. They believe that government, and not the woman, should dictate whether she can or cannot have control of her own body. They believe that government should have the power to force a woman to forgo a medically necessary procedure. They believe that women should be stripped of that power and stripped of the choice to decide what is best for herself. Many believe that even in cases of incest and rape, where the woman is a victim of a crime, that the woman should be compelled to bear the child against her will and bring the pregnancy to term. Talk about being intrusive.

Basically, the rights of women are being trampled to death. I thought we

had gotten beyond that, and now we see that we are moving in the wrong direction.

Empowering women is one of the most important things we can do for the future of our country. Core to women's constitutional liberties is autonomy over their own health and well-being. If we truly want to support women, we need to safeguard and improve, not limit, access to comprehensive healthcare.

I hope we can all agree that on this 100th anniversary of women's suffrage, we should be looking at ways to remove discrimination based upon sex and not moving in the wrong direction by taking away from women their right to make their own healthcare decisions.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, we are now 5 months into the new 116th Congress. During that 5-month period, the new Democratic majority in the House of Representatives has passed a series of bills on issues important to the overwhelming majority of the American public. They include legislation to reduce the death toll from gun violence by requiring universal criminal background checks and legislation to end the millions and millions of dollars of secret money flowing into elections and polluting our politics. The House legislation includes a bill to ensure that women receive equal pay for equal work, and the House has also passed legislation to strengthen the protections under the Violence Against Women Act. Those are just some of the initiatives the House has passed in the last 5 months.

Here in the Senate, what has the Senate done on those important issues? What has the Senate done with the legislation that the House has passed and is now sitting in this body? We have done nothing—zip. We haven't taken up any of those bills. In fact, the Senate Republican leader has refused to allow this body to consider those important measures.

What are we doing instead? Instead, the Senate is consuming all of its time not on the matters most important to the public but on debating and confirming judicial and executive branch nominees. Here is the thing: If you look at these judicial nominees—let's just take the ones we are looking at this week—you will find a very dangerous pattern.

This week, in looking at the five nominees, the pattern is selecting judges who will strip away women's reproductive choices and who will strip

away and potentially eliminate the rights under *Roe v. Wade*. That is the clear pattern.

If you look at the records of these nominees, they indicate hostility toward a woman's right to choose and hostility to *Roe v. Wade*. Take, for example, Stephen Clark. He is the nominee for the Eastern District of Missouri. He drew the outrageous comparison between Dred Scott and *Roe v. Wade*, including *Roe* as bad law. He also opposed provisions in the Affordable Care Act that would expand access to contraception to help people avoid unintended pregnancies.

Then there is the nomination of Kenneth Bell to be a judge in the Western District of North Carolina. He has argued that abortion rights, the pro-choice position, is "indefensible" and went on to say that "there is no middle ground" on this issue. In other words, he is another judge who would deny women the right of reproductive choice, and the list goes on if you look at the list of judges who are before the Senate this week.

This would be alarming at any point in time, but the timing of these nominations is no coincidence. Just in the last couple of months, we have seen States around the country passing laws to take away a woman's right to choose.

Let's take a look at Alabama. In the case of Alabama, they passed a law that denies a woman's right to choose to have an abortion even in the case of rape or incest. Under the Alabama law, doctors who perform abortions could be locked up in prison for up to 99 years—a prison term longer than that of a rapist.

We also have Candidate Trump arguing that not only should doctors be punished but women who exercise their rights to reproductive choice should be punished too.

Meanwhile, in addition to Alabama, five other States have passed laws that would outlaw abortion at a very early stage—in fact, at a stage of pregnancy when many women do not realize they are yet pregnant, especially if the pregnancy is unplanned and unexpected.

I think people recognize how outrageous it is to see State legislators and other elected officials who normally take the position that the government has no place in regulating or being involved in any aspect of our lives, who then take the position that they want the government right between a woman and her most sensitive decisions with respect to reproductive choice.

We have legislators who say they don't want the government protecting people from air pollution. They don't want to pass any regulations to protect people from air pollution or water pollution. We have some legislators who say they don't want any legislation to protect consumers from predatory lending or other scams in the economy. They don't think the government has a role there, but, by God, when it comes

to interfering with a woman's right to choose, they want the government smack in the middle of that decision. That is what Alabama has done. That is what the other five States have done.

Now we have judicial nominees coming before the Senate who are going to sign off potentially on those State laws.

It gets even more alarming because we also see a pattern from the judicial decisions that have been made and from the records of a lot of the nominees who are before us now of judges or people being appointed, who not only want to strip away a woman's right to reproductive choice but who actually want to go after programs that help provide family planning, programs that help prevent unwanted and unplanned pregnancies. So, on the one hand, States are passing these laws restricting a woman's right to choose, but at the same time they are saying that they want to get rid of or severely limit programs that prevent unintended pregnancies.

Looking at the figures from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention—and they keep statistics on all sorts of health indicators—you will find that from 2006 to the year 2015, there was a 24-percent drop in the number of abortions in the United States. There was a 24-percent drop in the years between 2006 and 2015. Researchers who have looked into this have determined that the biggest driver behind this decline in abortion has been increased access to contraception and family planning. Yet the Trump administration is going after and targeting for elimination the very programs that help reduce unintended pregnancy and, therefore, also help reduce abortions. So this administration is trying to take a hatchet to title X. They want to essentially take Planned Parenthood out of the equation, even though Planned Parenthood provides family planning services to 4 in 10 women.

As we all know, Planned Parenthood is barred by law from spending any Federal dollars on abortion. They spend most of their time counseling their patients on family planning and helping people make decisions about contraception to avoid unplanned pregnancies.

This administration tried to target the Teen Pregnancy Prevention Program. I know that because it went after a program in Baltimore City that has been very successful in reducing teenage pregnancy.

In fact, if you look at Baltimore from a period during the year of 2000 to 2016, we saw a 61-percent decline in teen pregnancy. That was as a result of a number of programs, easier access to contraception, the Teen Pregnancy Prevention Program that was targeted for elimination by the Trump administration, and, after the Affordable Care Act went into effect, the ability to access contraception as a result of the Affordable Care Act.

All of these measures to help prevent unplanned pregnancies have also helped to significantly reduce the number of abortions. Yet we have an administration that wants to go after those family planning programs, and we have a number of judges who would side with the administration. I will mention a couple of important family planning programs.

One is title X. This administration wanted to severely undermine title X. It has not been successful. Why not? Because it was taken to court. So far, the courts have stayed the administration's decision.

Let's look at the Teen Pregnancy Prevention Program, which I mentioned, that is so important in Baltimore. The administration wanted to eliminate it, and so we had to go to court. The judge said that it was an illegal action—an unauthorized action—by the Trump administration.

Let's look at the contraception provisions—the provisions on access to contraception—in the Affordable Care Act. This administration wants to wipe them out. The only reason they are still there is due to the courts. The courts have been very important not only in protecting a woman's right to choose but in protecting these important family planning programs that have prevented unintended pregnancies and, therefore, have also reduced the number of abortions.

Now we have a whole bunch of judges who are coming before the Senate who would rule differently in all of these cases. That is why I believe the American people need to really be alarmed about what is happening here. We are not acting on important measures that are coming out of the House that I mentioned earlier. What we are doing is spending the full time passing through judges—in a factory-like procedure here—who will undermine a woman's right to choose and go after important family planning programs. We have a lot to think about, and I hope all of our colleagues will recognize what is happening here.

I will go back to where I started.

Instead of churning out judges who are going to strip away the rights of women—and other nominees who side with big corporations against consumers—let's take up the legislation that is in front of us right now that has come over from the House.

We have before us H.R. 8. It is the Bipartisan Background Checks legislation. It was bipartisan because it came out of the House on a bipartisan vote.

It was bipartisan because, if you ask the public, 85 percent of the public is in favor of the simple idea that we should have criminal background checks and that the people who have committed crimes shouldn't be able to go to gun shows and purchase guns. If you have a record of posing a danger to the community, my goodness, why would we want to put a gun in your hand and endanger the community?

It is a pretty straightforward piece of legislation, and it has been in this Senate for 83 days now. For 83 days, it has been sitting right here in the Senate, but the Republican leader will not let us take it up to debate it or to vote on it.

I mentioned another bill that came over from the House that would get rid of secret money in politics. What do I mean by that?

After the Supreme Court decision in *Citizens United*, we had two things happen. One was that just a flood of corporate money flew into elections because, before that decision, corporations could not spend money directly to try to elect public officials. The Congress had previously passed a law to prevent that, and previous Supreme Courts had upheld that ban on corporate spending to try to elect public officials. In *Citizens United*, they decided, well, corporations are people, too, for the purpose of spending money in elections. So they got rid of that law.

If you read that opinion, even those who voted to overturn those laws said that what is going to protect the system will be the public's knowing who will be spending all of that money. They said: All right, we are going to let corporations spend all of that money. We are going to let 501(c)(4)s spend all of that money. Do you know what? The public will know, and that will serve as a check on the system. That will provide transparency, and the transparency will provide accountability.

Guess what. It didn't happen. In fact, the Senate's Republican leader has been one of the arch opponents of any kind of transparency and disclosure. I have had a long-running back-and-forth with him on this issue because, even if you look at the proponents of the terrible *Citizens United* decision, as I said, those Justices said: Well, transparency will take care of it. The reality is that people spend millions and millions of dollars in secret money in elections.

Let me just tell people that it may be secret to the public, but it is not a big secret to the candidates who are running. It is not a big secret to them who is spending millions of dollars to try to get them elected or to defeat them. That is a farce. Years ago, when I was in the House, I authored something called the DISCLOSE Act. It passed the House. It died here by one vote. We got 59 votes on an almost identical bill. It didn't get 60. So we still have secret money in politics today.

My view is that voters have a right to know who is spending millions of dollars to try to influence their decisions, and that is a big part of the bill that came over from the House 74 days ago. It is called the For the People Act. It has a lot of other important provisions in it to protect our elections and important provisions to make sure that we uphold the right to vote.

Among the important provisions is the DISCLOSE Act—to get rid of secret

money in politics. That is sitting over here and has been for 74 days.

What else has the House sent over? It sent over the Equal Pay Act, which has a pretty straightforward idea, and I think most Americans agree with it. In fact, public surveys show that people agree that if you put in an equal day's work—if you put in the sweat equity, if you do the job—and if a woman does the job just like the man does the job, by God, obviously, she should get paid the same amount. It is a pretty simple concept. That came over from the House. In fact, it came over from the House just 55 days ago. For 55 days, it has been sitting here.

Another bill that has come over from the House also relates to making sure that we address issues that are important to all of us, but it has specifically dealt with the Violence Against Women Act. What we say within the Violence Against Women Act, in the House bill, is that if you have someone who is abusing you in a relationship—it doesn't have to be your spouse; it could be someone else who is abusing you in a relationship—they shouldn't be able to go out and buy a gun. What we have seen from the sad statistics is that those kinds of situations often escalate into somebody's getting killed when someone is in a relationship in which one of the people in that relationship is abusing the other.

Just as we prevent the sale of guns to spouses who have records of domestic violence and domestic abuse, we should extend that prohibition on running out and getting guns to other abusive relationships. That was the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act, and it passed out of the House 47 days ago. So, 47 days ago, the House passed the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act.

It passed the Paycheck Fairness Act—equal pay for equal work—55 days ago.

It passed the For the People Act 74 days ago, which includes the provision to get rid of secret money in politics.

It also passed the Bipartisan Background Checks Act—to reduce the death toll from gun violence in our country—83 days ago.

All of those bills are sitting right here in the Senate. We could be debating them today if the Republican leader would allow them to come up. Instead of taking up that important work, we are here, acting like those in a factory who churn out more judges who have records of stripping women of their right to reproductive choice. It is a very, very dark time in the Senate, and I hope that we will get about the business of the American people and stop stripping women of their constitutional rights.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from Missouri.

NOMINATION OF STEPHEN R. CLARK

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I think, by any standard, it is a stretch to suggest that we are churning out judges.

We are doing our constitutional job of confirming judges that the President is constitutionally required to nominate. We are going to vote on a Missouri judge today, Judge Stephen Clark, to be a judge on the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri.

In the process of churning out judges, Judge Clark—or soon-to-be Judge Clark, I hope—was told by the White House in July of 2017 that he was going to be its nominee for this place on the court. If it were July of 2017 and it is now May of 2019, the churning is, obviously, not going very well. In fact, to get people to even serve in these jobs is going to get increasingly difficult.

In the case of Steve Clark and his family, he had a pretty unique practice that was focused on him and a couple of associates. I am not even sure of the kind of law they practiced, but I am sure it was not the kind of law that was referred to a minute ago. His wife was the assistant in the office, and I think they had an associate or two.

Yet, if all of your clients have been told for 20 months or so that you are going to be a district judge, the first question they ask is, Can you handle this case?

The answer you give is, Well, I don't know, but probably not. Eventually, Congress will get to this, and, eventually, I will be confirmed.

From the time of July 2017 to November 2018, there was nobody coming in the door anymore, and the law practice closed, as it should. It was not forced to close. Clearly, the best thing to do was to go ahead and admit that the supporting effort of that practice had gone away but that the overhead was still there. Since November, Stephen Clark has been waiting for this day to happen. This is not churning out judges, and I may get back to this topic in just a minute.

Certainly, for nominees like him who are willing to have their names submitted—who are willing to say yes when asked if they would be willing to be nominees—we have to do a better job, not the job of suggesting that somehow this happens easily to people who aren't qualified.

Steve Clark has been a respected, practicing attorney in the Eastern District of Missouri for 28 years. He knows the law; he knows the community. The American Bar Association rated him “well qualified” to hold this job.

He has been approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee twice now, once in 2016—see if I have that right; there is so much history here, it is hard to even know what the book would look like—and once before the 2018 election. Then all of these nominees had to be sent back to the White House, so after the 2018 election, after the Congress started work again in January of 2019, his name had to be resubmitted. The committee had to vote on him again. They had to look once again to see that he was “well qualified” to hold this job. They had to once again verify that he had 28 years in private practice.

We even had a past president of the Missouri Bar Association, who is a Democrat, say: "Steve Clark will make an excellent addition to the federal court bench."

The very idea that we characterize judges we are putting on the courts as enemies of any group of people is pretty offensive when you think about it. The law of the land is the law of the land. Judges are bound by precedent. Certainly, lawyers are bound by precedent. There is nothing to suggest anything other than the "well qualified" status of the bar association.

We need to fill this vacancy. We even have a temporary judgeship in the Eastern District. The workload is so great that the temporary judgeship should become permanent, but that is not the judgeship we are talking about here.

We are talking about somebody who is ready for this job, willing to give up his law practice with what should have been an absolute certainty he would be confirmed, but no absolute certainty he would be confirmed. I certainly wish the process hadn't taken so long, but I am glad we were able to adjust the rules of the Senate last month to start getting more people through that process. Without that, people in this case in my State—the people in the Eastern District of Missouri—would have to wait even longer. We may have never gotten this judgeship filled if we hadn't changed the rules.

Unfortunately, there are still a whole lot of people waiting to be confirmed to important jobs in the government. There is still too much obstruction for no real reason.

In fact, in past Congresses, judgeships like this would have been filled by unanimous consent. We would have filled five or six a day if we had vacancies of well-qualified candidates at the end of the day with no debate, but our friends on the other side have decided: No, we are going to take the maximum amount of debatable time available for, say, a Supreme Court Justice or the Attorney General of the United States, and we are going to apply that to every job—district judges, the assistant secretary of whatever, who is the lowest person appointed in whatever Cabinet office there is. We are going to apply the 30 hours to them. Of course, what you did to do that is use up all of this time because nothing else can happen on the floor during that 30 hours.

Was debate happening on the floor during that 30 hours? Of course not. The average debate time used during that 30 hours was 24 minutes. So for the other 29 hours and 36 minutes, nothing happened that related to that judgeship.

This morning, when I was driving to the Capitol, I actually heard somebody on one of the news programs say: Now they are forcing judges to be confirmed with only 2 hours of debate instead of the 30 hours that should have been used.

That would have been a valid criticism if the 30 hours were ever used, but

when the 30 hours is only 24 minutes, it is no criticism at all. It is a ridiculous position to take. You don't have to be a genius to see that it is designed to not allow the President to have the jobs confirmed in the government that the Congress has determined that the Senate would have to confirm. There are, I think, about 970 of them. By the way, if you took 30 hours for each of the 970, I think it would have been impossible—and we were proving it was impossible—for the President to ever get a government in place.

Then the judicial vacancies that occur—this is a vacancy we are filling today that was vacant months before President Trump was elected, maybe 3 months, maybe 4 months, but we haven't had anybody in this judgeship now for well over 2 years. In fact, as I said earlier, we have had, for 22 months, somebody who was told they were going to be the nominee and to prepare to serve.

In the 3 weeks we were in session before the rule change, we were able to confirm seven nominees in 3 weeks, and that was the principal work we were doing in that 3 weeks. These nominees fill jobs that are running the government or court positions that they are appointed to serve in for a long time. We filled seven of them in 3 weeks.

In the 3 weeks after we had the rule change, we cleared 24 nominees in that period of time.

By the way, the debate spent an average of 3 minutes—of the 2 hours that were available to those 24 nominees, the average time spent debating was 3 minutes. The minority is still suggesting that we are going to use the maximum time no matter how little time is used, no matter how little time is called for, because even if it is not 30 hours—it is now 2 hours—we can force 2 hours of no legislative opportunity and no legislative planning as the Senate tries to do part of the job that only the Senate can do. The House doesn't do this; only the Senate can do this. This is a job that is done by the President, who nominates, and the Senate, which confirms.

If you can keep the Senate confirming part to a maximum use of time, if you are in the minority, you can keep the legislating opportunities to a minimum.

Now, somebody might say: Well, gee, what would they bring to the floor? There are a lot of things we would bring to the floor if we had the time to get on them and stay on them.

Of course, we would really like to bring the appropriating bills to the floor soon and do those.

We cleared 24 nominees with an average of 3 minutes of talking about each one—maybe a few minutes. I think that even includes the time just making aspersions about these nominees in general, which don't relate to anybody. That would be included in that 3 minutes as well.

We continue to have a lack of cooperation to do the job of the Senate in the way that for 200 years it was done.

I hope my friends on the other side will begin to work with us and begin to understand that everybody has caught on. The people in this building and outside this building know what has been happening for almost 2.5 years now, and more responsibility is going to have to be taken than has been taken up until now.

I will say, again—almost 2 years after Steve Clark was nominated—I believe we will finish that job today, and if we do, it will be a good day for him, a good day for his family, and a good day for people waiting to get an opportunity on the Federal court docket in the Eastern District of Missouri to have a person not decided by me to be well qualified for the job but decided by the American Bar Association and twice approved by the Judiciary Committee of the U.S. Senate. While this work has taken a long time to get done, it will be good to see it done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this morning we had a meeting in Speaker PELOSI's office of the Democratic congressional leaders. It was in preparation for a meeting with President Trump.

Three weeks ago, NANCY PELOSI and CHUCK SCHUMER, the Democratic leaders of the House and Senate, asked for a sit-down with the President in the Cabinet Room to discuss the infrastructure of the United States of America—the backbone of our economy, a part of America that, sadly, has been neglected for too many years.

President Trump promised in his campaign there would be an infrastructure program—put America to work to build the roads, the bridges, and the airports, and I might say broadband and so many other things that need to be done—so that the strength of this economy would be there to entertain new business opportunities, to attract new jobs.

We had this meeting 3 weeks ago, and it was amazing how well it went. I was sitting just a couple of seats removed from the President and heard an agreement in the room from the Democratic leaders and the President—\$2 trillion, the President said. He rejected our offer of \$1.5 trillion and said: No, make it \$2 trillion that we will spend on our infrastructure.

Everybody sat up straight in their chairs and said: Well, this President is serious.

We said: Mr. President, will it be 80 percent Federal spending and 20 percent local, the way it has always been?

Yes.

Can we include rural broadband in here so those of us who represent small towns—rural areas that don't have the benefit of broadband services—can get into the 21st century in terms of education and telemedicine and all of the things that brings?

Yes.

He signed up for all these things—\$2 trillion, 80 percent Federal—and the list was long of things that we were going to do together.

We went into detail in that meeting 3 weeks ago with the President about some of the aspects of it. For example, the President said—and I think he has been quoted before—that he does not approve of public-private partnership programs. He argues there is too much litigation. That is all right with me and for most of the people in the room. We didn't have to have that if the President didn't want to include it. So there was back and forth in this conversation.

There was one element missing, and I remember RICHARD NEAL—who is the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, the critically important committee, the counterpart of Senate Finance—said to the President: Now, Mr. President, we have to pay for it. Two trillion dollars—how are we going to do that?

And the President said: Wait. I am not going to say that at this meeting. I know you want me to blink first as to how we are going to pay for it. I am not going to get into that.

There had been some proposals from Democrats of tax increases for wealthy people and corporations and such, but the President said: I won't get into that today. Let's meet 3 weeks from now and talk about how we are going to do this, how we are going to pay for the \$2 trillion.

So many of us sat down, Democrats—I hope Republicans, as well—and started thinking in positive terms about what this would mean for the economy. We can create tens of thousands of good-paying jobs across the United States, rebuild our infrastructure, and be ready to compete with countries like China and others that believe they are building faster and better than we are.

The meeting was scheduled for today. We started this morning with a briefing. The Democrats sat together in Speaker PELOSI's office, about 20 of us, and went through it and talked about what our presentation would be to the President and some ideas that we had to move forward.

We accepted the President's invitation. We went to the White House, gathered in the waiting room there, and then we were invited into the Cabinet Room. We walked into the Cabinet Room, took our assigned seats, looked across the table, and there was the Secretary of the Treasury, people from the Office of Management and Budget. The President's daughter was there. There was quite a gathering of people getting ready for this high-powered meeting.

We waited, and we waited, and then the door opened, and the President walked in. Without greeting anyone or sitting down he said: We are not going to have this meeting. We are not going to have this meeting because Congress continues to investigate me. I think we have had enough investigations, and

until the investigations end, there will be no infrastructure bill.

His statement went quite a bit beyond that, but I think that was a fair summary of his conclusion. He turned around and walked out.

So the meeting that he had called, the meeting we responded to so that we could come up with an infrastructure program, ended right on the spot.

The President then went out into what is known as the Rose Garden next to the White House and held a press conference with posters and signs saying: As long as Congress is investigating me, we won't be discussing issues like infrastructure.

That is an unfortunate development—unfortunate for America, first, because this President and this Congress, regardless of party, have a responsibility to the American people to do the basics to make sure that we provide what Americans need, what cities need, what businesses need, what families need to grow the economy and create good-paying jobs.

The President walked away from that this morning. So here we are at a point in history. I am not sure which way to turn. You see, every President would like to make this claim: I am not going to do business with Congress if you investigate me. But the bottom line is, every President is investigated. Their administration is investigated. That is what we do. That is what the U.S. Congress does. That is what happens in a democracy. No President can say: I am pulling down the shades, and I am closing the doors. You can't look at me, and you can't look at what we are doing, either in activities as individuals or as agencies.

No. There is accountability in our government. This Congress, the Senate, the House—we appropriate the funds for the executive branch, and we investigate them as we appropriate the money. How are you spending the taxpayers' dollars? Are you wasting them? Is there corruption involved in it? We ask those questions not just of this President but of every President. That is the nature of democracy, of accountability, and this President can't get off the hook. He may be weary of investigations—and I can tell you that President Obama was weary of investigations, too, and President Bush before him—but that is the nature of accountability in a democracy. For this President to say: No more. It is out of bounds for us to be investigated, and I won't do anything necessary for the economy and future of this country as long as the investigation continues—that is a sad day in the history of this country. I hope cooler heads will prevail, but I am not sure they will.

We have so much we need to do. Look at this empty Chamber here. My speech in this Chamber each day is basically what you are going to hear if you are a visitor to Washington, DC. You are not going to hear a debate on legislation. Wouldn't you like for this Chamber to be filled with Republicans and Demo-

crats who are debating a bill right now on the high cost of prescription drugs? I would. And we certainly have the power and responsibility to manage that issue, but we don't do it. We have done virtually nothing in this Chamber for this entire year.

Senator MCCONNELL has one goal: fill up Federal judicial vacancies with lifetime appointees as fast and as often as possible. We have seen men and women come before us, clearly unqualified to be judges, who are being given lifetime appointments. Why? It is part of a plan—a political plan to fill the courts with judges friendly to the Republican point of view. And so we do nothing else. Nothing else.

I have been here a few years, in the Senate and the House. There is an issue called disaster aid. I have seen 100 different variations. There will be some horrendous weather event—a fire, a drought, a flood—and we have responded time and again wherever it occurred. Without concern as to whether it was a red State or a blue State, we have come together as an American family and said: We will give you a helping hand.

We have a disaster bill that has been pending here for weeks, if not months. We can't even reach an agreement on how to send disaster aid to areas that have been hit by flooding and tornados, and it is an indication of what the problem is right here. The Senate is not being the Senate. It is not legislating. And now the President announced this morning that he has gone fishing. He is not going to be around to discuss issues like the infrastructure of this country.

What can we do about it? Well, you can appeal to your Members of Congress and tell them you are fed up with it, and I hope you do. That is what a democracy is about. But you can also make sure that you participate and vote in the next election. Ultimately, in a democracy, the American people have the last word at the polling place on election day. If you are satisfied with an empty Chamber doing nothing, ignoring infrastructure, delaying disaster aid, if you think that is a good thing for this country, I suppose you know how you should vote. But if you are fed up with it and looking for change, I hope people across this country will see what happened today as a call to arms—maybe, importantly, a call to the polls.

IRAN

Mr. President, yesterday there was a briefing for Members of the Senate, Democrats and Republicans. It was a closed-door briefing in an area of the Capitol the public has no access to. In that briefing room, they close the doors; they take away your telephone; and they ask if you have any other electronic devices to make sure that when you walk in that room, you can hear things, classified information, sometimes top-secret information, which is not available to most Americans and should not be. It is sensitive.

It is important. It relates to our national security. We don't meet there a lot—maybe once a month at most—and when we meet, we are together as Democrats and Republicans for a briefing.

The briefing yesterday was from the Secretary of State, Mr. Pompeo, and the Acting Secretary of Defense. They came in and talked to us about the situation in Iran. I can't disclose the specifics—I am duty bound not to—but I can speak in general terms about what was said and what I think it means to the rest of America.

I listened in disbelief yesterday to the administration's briefing justifying a confrontation with Iran. While I was listening, I thought to myself, before America plunges into another Middle Eastern war, we ought to take stock and remember how we got into the two wars in that part of the world—two wars, one of which is still raging, that left American soldiers subject to injury and death every day and cost American taxpayers billions of dollars.

When we got into wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, we were led to believe that suddenly there were urgent events spiraling out of control in the Middle East that could only be stopped by U.S. military intervention. Some of my colleagues still in Congress today were here during that debate. On the floor of the Senate, we voted on the question of the invasion of Iraq. I remember it because it was about 4 weeks before the election. The vote was taken around midnight, and most Members, as they voted, left. I stayed because I wanted to hear the final vote.

There were 23 of us who voted against the invasion of Iraq: 1 Republican—Senator Chafee—and 22 Democrats. I can recall that some of my colleagues who voted against that invasion of Iraq lingered in the well. One of them was Paul Wellstone of Minnesota. Wellstone was up for reelection—a tough reelection in his home State. The popular sentiment was on the side of the invasion of Iraq. Wellstone voted against it.

I went up to him, and I said: "Paul, I hope this doesn't cost you the election."

He said to me: "It is all right if it does. This is who I am. This is what I believe, and the people who elected me expect nothing less."

Sadly, Paul Wellstone died in a plane crash before that election a few weeks later. I still remember him right there in the well, talking to him about that vote.

At the time, we had been told by Vice President Cheney and others that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction, which threatened not only friends and allies, like Israel, but could threaten the United States of America.

Former Pentagon adviser Richard Perle argued before the invasion of Iraq that the Iraqis were going to pay for the war from their oil wealth. They would pay for this—whatever it would cost the American taxpayers—and he

said there was no doubt that they would.

President George W. Bush claimed the war was his last choice, and then he provocatively tried to link al-Qaida—the terrorists responsible for 9/11—with Saddam Hussein, the leader of Iraq—a specious claim that has never been proven and was restated by Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld. Rumsfeld even tried to claim that a war in Iraq would last—listen to this—"five days or [maybe] maybe five weeks or five months, but it certainly isn't going to last any longer than that," said our Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld. We are now in the 18th year of that war.

Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz and Vice President Cheney said that when the Americans arrive in Iraq, we would be welcomed as liberators. Wolfowitz went on to say—he estimated that this call for hundreds of thousands of American troops to fight there was way off the mark.

Five days or 5 weeks or 5 months?

Well, the war started not long after these claims. It included deploying more than 150,000 American troops over and over and over again, and it has lasted for 18 years. No weapons of mass destruction were ever found. We were not greeted as liberators. The Iraqi oil interest did not pay for the cost of the war; the American taxpayers and families did. Sadly, more than 4,500 Americans gave their lives in that war, and 32,000 were wounded, some gravely wounded.

One of those wounded veterans is my colleague in the Senate, Senator TAMMY DUCKWORTH. She was in the National Guard as a helicopter pilot. Twelve years ago, when she was flying over Iraq, a rocket-propelled grenade came into the cockpit and exploded. As the helicopter came to a crash on the ground, Tammy lost both of her legs and was at that point in danger of losing her arm, which she didn't, thank goodness. Today, she serves as my colleague in the Senate.

In one of the many cruel ironies in what I believe to be one of the worst foreign policy disasters in American history, the unintended consequence of our invasion of Iraq was to give the nation of Iran a strategic victory by virtually turning Iraq into a client state.

Make no mistake—our war and invasion of Iraq emboldened and empowered Iran. How do some of the current occupants of the White House driving policy against Iran feel about the Iraq war disaster? Well, in 2015, National Security Advisor John Bolton said: "I still think the decision to overthrow Saddam was correct." He made that statement 1 month after writing a New York Times op-ed—this is John Bolton, the President's National Security Advisor—an op-ed entitled: "To Stop Iran's Bomb, Bomb Iran."

Now match this painful lesson in history with the current President having surpassed 10,000 false or misleading claims so far in a little over 2 years in

office—more than 10,000 false claims in less than 3 years. So you will understand my skepticism in trusting this administration of the President's to tell us the truth about the next war they are planning in the Middle East. In fact, within a single week, President Trump tweeted that he had hoped not to go to war with Iran and then went on to tweet that he would lead the fight "that will be the official end of Iran." You can't keep up with this President and his tweets.

Does this not trouble or give pause to any Republican colleague whose constituents might be called to serve in the third Middle Eastern war that the United States is participating in?

Let me also remind my colleagues that before any one of us can vote on the Senate floor, we walk down this aisle, over to this corner, and wait for the Vice President of the United States to ask us to take the oath of office, to swear to uphold the Constitution of the United States.

The Constitution of this country makes it expressly clear that the decision to go to war cannot be made solely by a President; it is to be made by the American people through their elected representatives in Congress, in the House and in the Senate. Before there is any war, the American people should have the last word, according to our Constitution.

What I find most stunning about the administration's march to war in Iran is that its actions have really contributed to the current tension and confrontation we have in Iran. President Obama worked for years to come up with an agreement and to bring together an alliance to make certain that Iran could never develop a nuclear weapon.

Listen to the participants in this alliance: of course, the United Kingdom, our longtime ally; France; the European Union; the United States; Germany; Russia and China. They are all part of this agreement to stop Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. The Republicans opposed it to a person, but the President was able to implement it.

That agreement called for constant inspection by United Nation's agencies—nuclear agencies—to make certain that Iran lived up to the terms of the treaty and did not develop nuclear weapons. It worked. The inspectors came and told us, time and again, there were no locked doors, there was no denial of entry, no denial of access. They were able to look behind closed doors and came to the conclusion that Iran was complying with the treaty and not developing nuclear weapons.

Then President Trump announced he was walking away from this agreement, walking away from this requirement under the treaty for neutral inspectors to crawl all over Iran and make sure they were living up to the terms of the agreement. That was the beginning of the Trump policy on Iran that leads us to where we are today.

President Trump has been pursuing a provocative and incomprehensible policy of regime change in Iran, trying at one moment to flatter and meet with President Rouhani to negotiate and then the next moment threatening to obliterate Iran from the planet. President Trump withdrew from that nuclear agreement and tried to starve Iran of the agreed benefits it was to receive from that deal.

Let me be clear, there is no doubt that Iran is responsible for dangerous conduct around the world, which I will never approve of, but an Iran with nuclear weapons is dramatically more dangerous than one without. The President doesn't understand that basic fact. Why not push back against Iran without withdrawing from the nuclear agreement? Why give them the pretext for belligerence and undermine our credibility with the global powers that joined us in that nuclear agreement?

The tragic end result of this President's incoherent policy in Iran is that our allies are united against us, and Iran may restart nuclear activities within the next few weeks. President Trump's policy at the direction of Mr. Bolton seems to have only increased regional tensions, incentivized Iran to restart its nuclear weapons program, and fomented a pretext for another Middle Eastern war.

This Congress, too often a rubberstamp for this President's worst behavior, must do more in the next few weeks and months to stop this effort based on the briefing we received yesterday. Wars are so easy to get into and so difficult to get out of. When I hear our advisers, in general terms, talking about short wars, I think about Iraq, and I think about Afghanistan and the fact that, 18 years later, with gravestones all across the United States, we are still paying the price for decisions that were made so long ago. Let us think twice before we engage in direct military confrontation with any country and, certainly, with Iran.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1602 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Ms. COLLINS. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

SENATE LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I don't have a speech prepared. I just want to share a few thoughts with my colleagues. What I am about to say I intend to say gently and constructively, and that is this: We need to do more. We need to do more. By "we," I mean the U.S. Congress.

We have completed almost 25 percent of the time allotted to this current Congress. And what have we done? Other than nominations, which are important—and I will come back to that—we have done nothing—zero, zilch, nada.

Let me talk about my friends in the House of Representatives first. I have great respect for them. I wish I had served in the House. I would have loved to have had that experience. So far, our friends in the House—at least the leadership—have done two things. No. 1, they have passed bills they know have not a hope in Hades of passing the U.S. Senate. We call those bills messaging bills, as you know. They are not designed for the next generation. They are designed for the next election. They don't do anything to make the American people any more secure or improve the quality of their lives, and we all know that.

The second thing that my friends in the House leadership have done—and I say this with all the respect I can muster—is to harass the President.

Again, I say this gently, and I say this, hopefully, constructively to my friends in the House leadership: The House leadership needs to urinate or get off the pot. The House leadership needs to indict the President of the United States, impeach him, and let us hold a trial—he will not be convicted—or they need to go ahead and hold in contempt every single member of the Trump administration so we can move those issues into our court system and get back to doing the people's business.

Now, if they decide to go the court route, I would caution my friends to be very, very careful because once it enters the court system, it becomes a zero-sum game. One or two things are going to happen. Either the administration will win, in which case the oversight authority of the U.S. Congress will be undermined, or the House leadership will win, in which case no American with a brain above a single-cell organism is going to want to run for President of the United States, because Congress will be able to find out everything about your life, even the most intimate details, whether it is relevant to your job or not and whether it happened when you were President or not.

What I hope happens is that my friends in the House leadership and the administration sit down and talk—not talk like 8-year-olds in the back of a minivan fighting but talk constructively about how their behavior could impact important institutions in this country—and work it out.

I thank the Attorney General for making overtures to the House leadership to try to find common ground.

Now, let me talk about the Senate. We need to do more. I am not saying we haven't done anything. We have confirmed some very important nominees to the Trump administration. It is long overdue. They are fine men and women. We have confirmed some very fine men and women to the Federal Judiciary, and I believe they will make this country safer and will make this country better. I am very proud of that effort. So let me say it again. I am not saying we have done nothing. I am saying we need to do more.

There are issues where our Democratic friends and my Republican friends have more in common than we don't. We need to bring the bills to the floor of the Senate. Everyone has their own list, and everyone in the Senate knows what I am talking about, whether they will say it or not.

What is one of the things that moms and dads worry about when they lie down at night and can't sleep? The cost of prescription drugs. There is bipartisan support for prescription drug reform.

I just read a study in the Journal of the American Medical Association. They studied the U.S. healthcare delivery system and the healthcare delivery systems of all other wealthy countries. So it is apples to apples. In America, we pay about \$1,500 for every man, woman, or child every year for pharmaceutical drugs. In the average rich country, other countries pay \$750.

I am not criticizing our pharmaceutical drug companies. What they do is marvelous. We live longer. They save money. They keep us out of hospitals. But why is everybody else paying \$750 and our people are paying \$1,500? There are things we can do that will help make the pharmaceutical industry better but also help consumers. Do you know what we are doing about it? Nothing. We need to bring a bill to the floor.

I could give you another example. We all know there needs to be reform of our National Emergency Act. We know that. It is not about President Trump. It is about institutions, checks and balances, and Madisonian separation of powers.

We could do something together to get rid of spam robocalls. I get about 12 a day.

ROB PORTMAN has a great bill that would end government shutdowns. We have more in common on that than we don't.

We need a supplemental disaster bill. We have Americans who are hurting. In my State, after Katrina, we were flat on our backs. If it hadn't been for the American taxpayer, we would have never risen to our knees, much less to our feet. We have other Americans and friends in Puerto Rico who need help. We ought to be able to work it out.

I could keep going. Everybody has their own list.

I don't care whether we move a bill through committee or whether we bring a bill directly to the floor of the Senate—I am in labor, not management; that is above my pay grade—but we need to try. We need to try.

I understand it is an election cycle. I get that. I say to the Presiding Officer, I am a politician. You know that. But we are always in an election cycle. When are we not in an election cycle? And I understand some of my colleagues with a lot more experience than I have—and I listen carefully to them, and I try to listen carefully to them—are thinking right now: Kennedy, that is just not the way it is done here.

Well, by God, maybe it is not, but maybe it should be.

I know some of my friends are thinking: Kennedy, if we do that, we are taking too big of a political risk.

Maybe we are. Maybe we will win.

I just think that there are bills that will make the American people able to live better lives, and we ought to spend a little more time thinking about the next generation than the next election.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE FEDERALIST SOCIETY

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, on Tuesday, the Washington Post published an important piece of investigative journalism. The journalists looked into a very narrow, very wealthy group of special interests seeking to control our Federal judiciary. It was a revealing story, one that matters a great deal to the Senate and to the people we serve. I come to the floor today to discuss that tightening special interest grip on our courts.

The central operative in this court-fixing scheme is Leonard Leo of the Federalist Society, the organization at the center of this effort. As I described here on the Senate floor several weeks ago, there are three incarnations of the Federalist Society.

The first is a debating society for conservatives at law schools. They convene panels and forums for like-minded, aspiring lawyers to talk about conservative ideas and judicial doctrine. That is all fine.

The second is a flashy Washington, DC, think tank. They attract big-name lawyers, scholars, and politicians—even Supreme Court Justices—to their events. They publish and podcast. They hold black tie galas. I don't agree with the work they do, but I don't question their right to do it.

The third Federalist Society is what was exposed in the Post article. It is something much, much darker, both in its funding and in its function. It is a vehicle for powerful interests seeking to "reorder" the judiciary under their control so as to benefit their corporate rightwing purposes. It seeks to accomplish by judicial power grab what the Republican Party has been unable to accomplish through the open Democratic process.

This third, dark Federalist Society understands the fundamental power through the Federal judiciary to rig the system in favor of special interests.

So what did the Post find out about how our judges on the most important courts in the country are selected? It found a network of front groups. It found shell entities with no employees.

It found shared post office mail drops, common contractors and officers across nominally separate entities, even common presidents of nominally separate entities. In these characteristics, it has some resemblance to money laundering and crime syndicates.

What else did they find? They found dark money funders, anonymous advertising, enormous pay packages for the operatives, and judicial lists prepared secretly. It found \$250 million in dark money flowing through this apparatus.

The story turns up familiar dark money political funders like the Mercers and the National Rifle Association, but it also exposes groups that are harder to spot, which may not have garnered much attention before but serve central functions in Leonard Leo's court-fixing apparatus.

A few weeks ago I delivered remarks on the Senate floor about the sweeping influence of Leonard Leo and the Federalist Society court-fixing scheme. I touched on one Federalist Society product of this scheme in particular: the newly confirmed DC Court of Appeals judge, Neomi Rao. I described some pretty straightforward facts about Rao. Her connection to the Federalist Society is no secret. Sitting on the DC Circuit right now, her bio still appears on the Federalist Society website along with the list of 26 times she has been featured—26 times she has been featured at Federalist Society events.

Before being nominated for one of the most influential courts in the country, which some call the second highest court in the land, she had never been a judge, she had never tried a case. Instead, she had served as the Trump administration's point person for helping big Republican donors tear down Federal safety regulations. She did this as the head of the White House's Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, OIRA. That is not disputed.

Before that, she founded something provocatively called the Center for the Study of the Administrative State at George Mason University's Antonin Scalia Law School. Her center is a cog in Leonard Leo's machine.

Let's revisit Rao's testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee about the funding for the Center for the Study of the Administrative State. She testified that neither the Koch Foundation nor any anonymous donors had funded her center. Well, a trove of documents obtained by me, the New York Times, and others showed that was not true. A Virginia open records request had revealed that an anonymous donor funneling its dark money donation through Leonard Leo and the Charles Koch Foundation in fact donated \$30 million intended to flow to her organization, her Center for the Study of the Administrative State.

Well, my remarks drew quite a reaction. The center's current director took to Medium to post a 2,500-word rebuttal. He claimed I was all wrong about the center's funding—that none

of its money came from those anonymous and Koch brothers' donations.

The National Review jumped into the fray and noted the Medium post on its website. The nub of their criticism was that although I was right, the Scalia Law School had indeed received millions in anonymous and Koch brothers' money. That money had gone to fund scholarships, not to the anti-regulatory Center for the Study of the Administrative State.

Let's start by assuming that is true. I will tell you, if I gave \$30 million to my alma mater "for scholarships," I would expect a thank-you. I expect they would see a gift of \$30 million in scholarships as a benefit to the school. If they were asked "Has Senator WHITEHOUSE ever given you a gift?" I would expect them to say "Yes, he gave us a \$30 million scholarship fund." I might even expect a nice press release. So I don't buy the "this was just scholarships money" dodge around telling the truth to the Judiciary Committee.

But look a little more. In 2016, George Mason University, indeed, received a \$10 million donation from the Charles Koch Foundation and, indeed, did receive a \$20 million donation from an anonymous donor. Both gifts came with grant agreements, and these grant agreements were among the Virginia open records documents. So we can learn a little bit more.

The grant agreements stipulate that the money was intended to fund "scholarships" but also specify that gifts were conditioned on the school's providing "funding . . . and support for"—you guessed it—Neomi Rao's Center for the Study of the Administrative State.

That is not all we found. Private communications revealed with the grant agreements show that the Koch Foundation and their handpicked law school administrators viewed all of this money as fungible.

I earlier said that if I gave \$30 million, I might expect a press release. The Antonin Scalia Law School did a press release. Its announcement of this funding stated: "The scholarship money will also benefit the institution because it frees up resources that can be allocated for other priorities, including additional faculty hires and support for academic programs."

It didn't end there. The documents keep telling us more. They include a progress report—a progress report—to the Koch Foundation. Under the heading "most pressing needs," Dean Henry Butler wrote to the Koch Foundation: "Cash is King (scholarships are cash)." In that same memo to the Koch Foundation—which, by the way, is kind of a bizarre document to exist in the first place, unless this is kind of a front for Koch brothers' political activities—Dean Butler also made clear that Rao's center had indeed received hundreds of thousands in funding from an anonymous donor, just as I charged, and further made clear that Rao's center was

being funded with \$400,000 from “naming-gifts scholarship revenue”—the Koch brothers’ “scholarships” money that was earmarked for Neomi Rao’s center. It was being rerouted to fund Leonard Leo and Neomi Rao’s project to gut public protections in this country on behalf of those donors. The dark plot thickened.

Here is the most interesting part of all. The open records documents also show that the law school dean, Henry Butler, regularly reported to Leonard Leo on developments at Neomi Rao’s center, including faculty hiring and other Federalist Society priorities. The emails are very cozy. The dean is deferential. There is even a calendar entry for lunch at a Washington, DC, restaurant for Neomi Rao, Henry Butler, and Leonard Leo. Cozier still is that another condition of the Koch Foundation’s massive gift was that Henry Butler be protected as dean because they viewed him—specifically him—as “critical to advancing the school’s mission.” That mission? Doing the Koch Foundation and Leonard Leo’s bidding to help cripple public interest protections in this country for big special interests funding Leo, funding the center, and funding the Federalist Society.

Neomi Rao’s defenders were quick to push back on this point and argued that my criticisms of her center’s work was stifling their academic inquiry. They pointed to the center’s research roundtables and public policy conferences as evidence of its fair and independent academic bona fides.

Sorry, but it is tough to buy when, in one private fundraising email, Dean Butler was revealed to have asked one wealthy donor for a \$1.5 million gift “to entice Neomi [Rao] to return home to Scalia Law after she dismantles the administrative state.”

Tell me, who is the real threat to academic inquiry here?

Perhaps more to the point, now that she is a judge: Who is a present threat to judicial independence on the DC Circuit Court of Appeals?

Fancy lunches and weird, cozy relationships between public law school deans and DC power brokers can seem a bit in the weeds, so let’s not lose sight of the bigger picture here. This stuff matters because Americans are now seeing their courts fill with judges, like Neomi Rao, who are expected and chosen to reliably rule for big corporate and Republican partisan special interests—the ones funding the Federalist Society’s selection of these judges, the ones funding the Judicial Crisis Network’s confirmation of these judges, the ones funding Amici, the front group Amici that shows up to argue in court.

I recently looked at the numbers for the Federalist Society-dominated Supreme Court. Under Chief Justice Roberts’ tenure, through the end of the October term of 2017 to 2018, Republican appointees delivered partisan 5-to-4 rulings that favored corporate or Republican partisan special interests, not

three or four times, not even a dozen or two dozen times, but 73 times. If you look at the Court’s cases during Chief Justice Roberts’ tenure and look at the 5-to-4 decisions and look at the 5-to-4 decisions wherein the breakdown between the five and the four was partisan and look at those 5-to-4 partisan decisions, for the ones in which there was a clearly apparent, big Republican donor interest, you will find that every single one of those 73 decisions was won—was decided—in favor of the big Republican donor interest. There were 73 victories delivered for big Republican interests with there being no Democratic appointee who joined the majority.

Here is one case study—a recent decision after the 73. It is *Lamps Plus v. Varela*. The plaintiff, Frank Varela, sued his employer, Lamps Plus, after a company data breach led to a fraudulent tax return being filed in his name. An appellate court looked at the case and relied on a State contract principle to agree with plaintiff Varela. That is a traditionally conservative principle—deferring to State laws. Along came the Supreme Court in this case, and it ditched the conservative principle to rule in favor of the corporation in a 5-to-4 partisan decision.

There is another case study pending before the Court now—*Kisor v. Wilkie*. On its face, Kisor addresses an obscure administrative law doctrine about judicial deference to Federal Agencies, but Kisor has been described as a “stalking horse for much larger game.” The larger purpose is to strip away judicial deference to administrative Agencies’ capacity to regulate independently in the public’s interest.

You have to understand that if you are a mighty corporation, you come to an administrative Agency from a position of terrific advantage ordinarily, and where administrative Agencies are willing to stand up, that is important, but if you can get your judges on a court and strip away that deference, now you can put the fix in through the courts.

Imagine a world in which Federal Agencies get virtually no judicial deference and in which Leonard Leo’s special interest, handpicked judges rule on Americans’ disputes with big corporations. If these big special interests are sick of protections for workers in the workplace, let the judges get rid of them. Dismantle the administrative state. If a big special interest is sick of safeguards for our air and water or dangers in toys our children play with, dismantle the administrative state. Tear down the safety regulations. They will have the judges to do that. If corporations are sick of a guardrail that keeps our financial system from dragging down millions of Americans’ financial security, these judges stand ready to dismantle the administrative state that protects investors.

Leonard Leo’s dark Federalist Society element is installing judges who are poised to systematically and re-

lentlessly dismantle government Agencies that are sworn to keep us safe and secure.

How do you push back on this machine wherein the big-money special interests select a nominee by contributing to the Federalist Society and Leonard Leo’s secretive judicial lists and judge-picking process? They spend money campaigning for their selected judge’s confirmation through the Judicial Crisis Network. They then spend money through amicus briefs and argue before the judges on whom they have spent money to select and confirm. Sure enough—bingo—it is 73 to 0 in the important decisions in which they can get the Republican appointees to gang up in a group of five and deliver and deliver for the interests of the center of this, which you can’t properly identify because it is not transparent.

The Federalist Society doesn’t disclose its donors. The Judicial Crisis Network doesn’t disclose its donors. The Supreme Court rule doesn’t get at who the real donors are to this phony front group, Amici. You find out later on who the winners are—73 to nothing.

How do you push back on that machine? You push back with sunlight, with transparency. We must have transparency in our campaign finance system. We must have transparency in this special interest conveyor belt that is filling our courts. We should also have transparency in the courts. Right now, the dark money-funded front groups behind Leonard Leo and behind the Federalist Society’s judge-picking operation are probably also behind those amicus briefs. With a little transparency, we would know. It is through these amicus briefs that the judges who were selected and confirmed by these folks get instructed on how they should rule. This is a recipe for corruption.

The Court itself should require real transparency from so-called friends of the Court. These amicus groups come in under a Supreme Court rule. The Supreme Court rule only requires them to disclose who paid for the brief. Yet who is really behind the group? We don’t know. The Supreme Court could correct that. It could correct it like that, but then it would start to expose who is here.

If the Court will not, Congress must. Democracy dies in darkness, it has been said, and so does judicial independence. The American people deserve to know when powerful special interests are paying to sway Federal judges with self-serving legal advice. If those same interests paid to get those judges selected and paid to campaign for their confirmations and then paid to have the amicus briefs put before the Court, the need for the American people to understand what is going on becomes even more profound.

I close with a big thank-you to the Washington Post for its reporting. Thanks to its careful investigative work of its pouring through tax records and interviews, we now know a lot

more about the Federalist Society's court-fixing operation.

Our President likes to describe investigative journalism that pokes and probes at the mischief of his administration as fake news. There is nothing fake about this news. This is in the best traditions of investigative journalism, and I am grateful for its work to illustrate how our courts are being captured by corporations and runaway partisanship that is fueled by dark money.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

HEALTHCARE

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the ongoing threat from the Trump administration to healthcare and the guaranteed protections that millions of American families depend upon.

President Trump has tried to pass repeal plans that would take people's healthcare away and allow insurance companies to charge more for people with preexisting health conditions or those insurance companies could deny them coverage altogether.

When that repeal plan failed to pass in the Senate in the summer of 2017, instead of working in a bipartisan way to lower healthcare costs, President Trump turned to truly sabotaging our healthcare system.

What do I mean by that?

The Trump administration made it harder for people to sign up for the Affordable Care Act coverage. They have done so by limiting the window of time when people can enroll. They have truly created instability in the healthcare market, and their sabotage has contributed to premium spikes that we have seen across the country, including in my home State of Wisconsin.

The Trump administration has even gone to court to support a lawsuit in order to overturn the Affordable Care Act completely, and that, of course, would include protections for people with preexisting health conditions. They have essentially gone into court to ask the court to strike down the Affordable Care Act. Now, if they were to succeed, insurance companies will again be able to deny coverage or charge much higher premiums for the more than 130 million Americans who have some sort of preexisting health condition. The number with preexisting health conditions includes some 2 million Wisconsinites.

What is the President's plan to protect people with preexisting health conditions? He doesn't have one, and I don't believe he ever will.

In fact, he has acted in just the opposite vein. This administration has expanded junk insurance plans that can deny coverage to people with preexisting conditions, and they don't have to cover essential services like prescription drugs or emergency room care or maternity care.

I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle to think about this for a mo-

ment. President Trump supports overturning the law that provides protections for people with preexisting health conditions at the same time he is expanding these junk plans that don't provide those very protections. If this isn't straight-up sabotage, I really don't know what is.

When I was 9 years old, I got sick. I was really sick. I was in the hospital for 3 months. Now, I recovered, but my family still struggled because I had been branded with the words "pre-existing health condition" and I was denied insurance coverage.

That family and personal experience has driven my fight to make sure that every American has affordable and quality healthcare coverage.

Today, because of the Affordable Care Act, those with preexisting health conditions cannot be discriminated against. They can't be denied healthcare coverage, and they can't be charged discriminatory premiums.

I want to protect the guaranteed healthcare protections that so many millions of Americans now depend upon. I have introduced legislation along with my colleague Senator DOUG JONES of Alabama to overturn the Trump administration's expansion of junk insurance plans.

The entire Senate Democratic caucus, including the two Independents who caucus with us, have supported this legislation. They have signed on to this bill. The Nation's top healthcare organizations, representing tens of thousands of doctors and physicians, and patients and medical students, and other health experts have supported this legislation and endorsed it. Anyone who says they support healthcare coverage for people with preexisting conditions should support my legislation.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1556

Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1556; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Reserving the right to object, this is the latest Democratic attempt to raise the cost of healthcare paid for out of your own pocket by taking away an ability to provide lower cost health insurance that preserves preexisting condition protection and the essential health benefits. These short-term health benefits were available under President Clinton. They were available under President Bush. They were available under President Obama right until the last few months of his office, when he cut them down to 3 months long.

President Trump has simply said that you may now have them up to a

year and renew them for 3 years. If you live in Fulton County, GA, your insurance costs will be 30 percent less against the typical ObamaCare bronze plan and even more against the silver plan.

This is the latest Democratic attempt to increase the cost of what you pay for healthcare out of your own pocket. Their next attempt will be Medicare for All, which, if you have health insurance on the job, will take that health insurance away.

I object.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I am certainly disappointed that my Republican colleagues have chosen to object to protecting people with preexisting conditions.

It is my contention that some of the very opposite impacts, because of these junk plans, are occurring than what my colleague has recited. In fact, I hardly consider them insurance plans. Many have argued that they are not worth the paper that they are written on. They don't cover many essential benefits. They are not required to cover people with preexisting health conditions. They can drop people. They can charge outrageous prices. What we found—and the reason that the Obama administration went from yearlong plans to 3-month plans—is that they saw the distortion in the markets. They saw that people who had believed that they might not get sick—healthy, often younger people—were availing themselves of these plans, making the Affordable Care—

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Ms. BALDWIN. I would yield to one question, and then I want to wrap up my comments.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, is the Senator of Wisconsin not aware that the short-term healthcare plans do not change the law of preexisting condition?

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, these short-term plans do not have to cover preexisting conditions. I can tell you, as I have inquired—

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, may I—

Ms. BALDWIN. I yielded already for a question. But I want to say—

Mr. ALEXANDER. She gave the wrong answer, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

Ms. BALDWIN. It may not be to the Senator's liking, but I was going to tell you about the plans that I read the fine print on from the State of Wisconsin. Now that these short-term plans are renewable for up to 3 years, in these junk plans, you can see the fine print. Many times they start with this: We will not cover a preexisting condition. Every single one of them refuses to cover maternity care. That means none of these junk plans cover that essential benefit. Most of them don't cover

emergency room care. Most of them don't cover prescription drugs. So regardless of how the law impacts people who have other types of insurance, I feel strongly that these junk plans are very distorting of the market and not worth the paper they are written on for those who have chosen to take that route.

Last fall, we heard all my colleagues across the aisle say, often repeatedly, that they support protections for people with preexisting health conditions. Today I just offered an opportunity for Democrats and Republicans to come together to protect people's access to quality, affordable healthcare when they need it the most, but there was an objection.

I say to the American people that we must not lose sight of the fight right in front of us. We have a President who time after time has sabotaged our healthcare system, raised healthcare costs, and pushed these junk insurance plans that don't have to cover people with preexisting conditions. We have an administration that is asking a court to strike down the Affordable Care Act and its protections for people with preexisting conditions in their entirety.

The choice for the American people could not be more clear. We want to make things better, and my Republican colleagues refuse to join us in this effort, which would be to prevent this administration from making things worse.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

PROTECTING AMERICANS WITH PREEXISTING CONDITIONS ACT OF 2019

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, the House recently passed a piece of legislation called the Protecting Americans with Preexisting Conditions Act. The substance of this legislation would prevent a Trump administration rule from going into effect that would allow for States to license the kind of insurance plans that Senator BALDWIN was referring to. These are plans that do not cover preexisting conditions or the essential healthcare benefits.

I am going to offer right now a unanimous consent request to proceed to immediate consideration of this bill. I suspect it will be objected to. After an opportunity for Republicans to object, I will speak to the merits of this legislation. So let me start with a request to bring this legislation that will protect people with preexisting conditions and the essential healthcare benefits to the floor.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 986

Mr. President, my motion is as such: As if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 90, H.R. 986, Protecting Americans with Preexisting Conditions Act of 2019; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, reserving my right to object, section 1332 is the innovation waiver that is part of the Affordable Care Act, passed by the Democratic majority. That act includes protection for preexisting conditions. Using the flexibility granted under section 1332 does not change anything about preexisting conditions. So it is misleading to the American people to suggest that it does.

This is another Democratic attempt to make it more expensive, to cost more for what you pay for healthcare out of your own pocket by taking away flexibility from the States to find a less expensive way for you to afford healthcare and, at the same time, not changing the preexisting condition protection that is provided by the Affordable Care Act. This is the latest attempt to do it, but the boldest attempt to raise the cost of your healthcare is Medicare for All, which if you have insurance on the job, as 181 million Americans do, would take that insurance away from you.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you, Mr. President. Again, I share in Senator BALDWIN's disappointment that we can't move immediately to this legislation. This isn't a political game. These are individuals all across the country who are relying on us to make sure that they are not subject to the abuses of the market. They are relying on us to make sure we don't return to the days in which insurance companies could prevent you from getting healthcare simply because you were sick or return to the days when you bought an insurance product and then it didn't turn out to ultimately be insurance.

Let's be clear. The waiver that the President has allowed States to take advantage of would absolutely—it would by definition of the rule—allow for States to waive the preexisting condition requirement. The rule itself says that the innovation that happens at the State level does not have to comply with the essential healthcare benefits requirement. It says in the rule that you do not have to comply with preexisting conditions requirements. That is the reason that they are so cheap. So I am at a loss as to why we have Republicans on the floor saying that preexisting conditions will be protected under this rule. That is not true. The rule says that States do not have to comply with the preexisting requirement. It says that States do not have to cover essential healthcare benefits. That is why these junk plans are attractive, because they aren't actually insurance, and they are only insurance for people who are at the time very healthy.

We have to get on the same page here. We have to be reading from the same script. The fact of the matter is,

the definition of the rule allows for protections for people with preexisting conditions to be discriminated against.

I am sorry that we weren't able to bring up this piece of legislation because healthcare insurance should be healthcare insurance. And what we worry about are two things. First is that by allowing for the marketing of these junk plans, you are going to have all sorts of people who today aren't sick jumping into those plans, coming off of the plans that protect people with preexisting conditions. The people who are going to be left behind on those regulated plans are people who are sick, people who have preexisting conditions. So you are, all of a sudden, bifurcating the insurance market. You are going to have a market for people who are currently healthy, and then you are going to have a market for people who are sick or have ever had a preexisting condition.

You do not have to be an actuary and you don't have to have taken classes in healthcare insurance economics to know that when that happens, rates skyrocket for people who have a preexisting condition—for the millions of people around this country who have had a serious diagnosis at some point during their life.

So as you sell these junk plans, there is no way but for costs to go up. That is on top of the increases we saw last year. Last year, insurance companies priced in the costs of Trump administration sabotage. They priced into their premiums the attacks on our healthcare system from the Republican Congress.

In many States, we saw insurance plans pushing 60 percent, 40 percent, and, in some cases, 80 percent increases in premiums. Now on top of that, for sick people, for people with preexisting conditions, the rates are going to be even bigger because of the flight of those without preexisting conditions into marketplaces set up specifically for them.

The second thing we worry about is that these junk plans market themselves as insurance, but they aren't. Here is a list of things that I would generally consider to be covered under my insurance plan.

If I bought an insurance plan, if I handed over a check to the insurance company, I kind of think that if I go to the emergency room, I am not going to have to pay for it out of my pocket. I am thinking to myself: Well, you know what, if I need prescription drugs, they are going to cover some of that. Well, if I have a mental health diagnosis, doesn't insurance cover my head as well as the rest of my body?

These are the things that I would assume that insurance covers, but these junk plans don't cover these things.

Junk plans do not cover trips to the emergency room. Junk plans often don't cover hospitalizations. They don't cover prescription drugs. Almost none of them cover maternity care. Your checkups might not be covered

under a junk plan. Preexisting conditions will cost you more. Contraception isn't going to be in lots of these plans. They are not required to cover lab services or pediatrics. Mental health isn't going to be in many of these junk plans. As for rehab services, if you get injured, you are not going to find those in some of these plans. And if you have a chronic disease, there is nothing in the law that requires treatment for those to be covered.

So all of a sudden, as for the things you thought insurance covered, they don't cover it, and you have been paying a premium for years. Then, when you finally need access to the system, it is not there. That is what these plans can do. That is what the law and the Trump administration rule allows States to license as insurance. And that is why we are on the floor today, to ask—to plead—to our colleagues to bring legislation before this body, either Senator BALDWIN's legislation or Representative KUSTER's legislation that has already passed the House, that would stop these junk insurance plans from being sold all around this country, which will trick many Americans into believing they have insurance when they don't and will dramatically raise the cost of care potentially in many States for people who have serious preexisting conditions.

I am not surprised at the objection to both of our unanimous consent requests. Nevertheless, I am disappointed in it. We will continue to be down here on the floor for as much time as it takes to try to rally the whole of this body to protect people with preexisting conditions, to fight back against the sabotage of the Affordable Care Act and the healthcare system by this President. Hopefully, one day we will be successful.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I am proud to be here on the floor today to join with Senator BALDWIN and Senator JONES on their resolution with Senator MURPHY. I have to say to Senator MURPHY, before he puts that down, I have to look at that list and tell you that, before the Affordable Care Act, I would get calls like this, and I am sure you did, too.

Someone calls me and would say: I paid into healthcare all my life and never gotten sick, and then I finally needed surgery. What do you mean it only pays for 1 day in the hospital? Well, it never paid for more than 1 day in the hospital, but they didn't know it because they didn't get sick.

So folks buy the junk plans—and thank you for the list—but they buy the junk plan being healthy and then will never know that it doesn't cover those things unless they get sick. When they find out, it will be too late.

So that is why we are here because we know that healthcare isn't political. It shouldn't be political. It is personal for every one of us. It is personal

for ourselves and our families. It affects all of us, whether we are Democrats, Republicans, Independents, vote, don't vote, urban, rural from any State in the Union.

In fact, when people tell me their healthcare stories, they don't start by telling me their political affiliation. They talk to me about what has happened to them, what has happened to their mom and dad, what has happened to their children. Political affiliation doesn't matter.

People in Michigan simply want to know that the healthcare they depend on will be there for them and be affordable for them and their family today and into the future, and that is the fight that we have as Democrats. We will continue that fight.

Unfortunately, they have reason to be worried about the rise of short-term, limited duration insurance plans. They should be worried about what these plans don't cover—junk plans, as we are calling them. As Senator BALDWIN said so well, they are junk. They don't really cover anything. They make you feel good, as long as you are healthy, that you have got insurance, but then you find out, when you get sick, that your child is not covered or you are not covered.

The fact many of these plans are medically unwritten, which means that the insurance company—by the way, junk plans are about putting decisions back in the hands of the insurance company, instead of you knowing that you and your doctor can decide what you need and that it will be covered. The insurance companies can charge whatever they want based on somebody's health, gender, age, or other status.

Remember when being a woman was considered a preexisting condition? I do. These plans are bringing that back. One recent study found that none of these plans that have been approved by the Trump administration so far cover maternity care—none of them. We fought hard—I fought hard—as a member of the Finance Committee to make sure that women's healthcare and maternity care were covered. Our healthcare is as basic a healthcare as any man's healthcare and ought to be covered the same.

I want to repeat this. We have a maternal health crisis in this country, and the administration is pushing plans that don't cover basic coverage for women. On top of that, these junk plans can exclude people with preexisting conditions—yes, they can—and impose yearly or lifetime caps on care.

Remember when you had to worry about how many cancer treatments the insurance company would pay for? Now, there aren't caps so that you can decide and your doctor can decide with you on what it takes to put you in remission and put you on a healthy path. It is estimated about half of Michigan families include somebody with a preexisting condition—about half—with everything from heart disease to asth-

ma to arthritis. I met with some of them earlier this month during the National Brain Tumor Society's Head to the Hill event.

Tiffany, who is from Livonia, was just 17 years old when she was diagnosed with a brain tumor. Since then, her tumor has reoccurred six times. She has been through seven surgeries, chemotherapy, and radiation treatments. The location of her tumor means that Tiffany has also lost some of the use of her left arm and hand. Tiffany doesn't have a choice. Her life depends on having comprehensive health insurance. Unfortunately, that kind of insurance is getting less and less affordable.

So when our Republican colleagues come to the floor and say that we just want to raise prices, let me tell you what has really happened in the last year. The sabotage by the Trump administration, the unravelling of the Affordable Care Act, the junk plans, now the instability and going into court to try to totally repeal the Affordable Care Act, all of that instability—everything that has been done—means that comprehensive health insurance costs have gone up 16.6 percent this year, so somebody buying insurance is paying an average 16.6 percent more than they did last year because of all of this effort to sabotage, undermine, and unravel the healthcare system.

Tiffany should be able to focus on getting the treatment she needs and living her best life possible, not how she will pay for the insurance she needs. We all know Tiffany isn't alone. It is estimated that 130 million people in our country are living with preexisting conditions—130 million people. That is 130 million people who could be hurt either directly or indirectly by these short-term junk plans.

Two weeks ago, I had the chance to speak at the Detroit Race for the Cure, which raises money for breast cancer research and services. As I stood on the stage and looked out at over 10,000 people, a lot of beautiful pink all surrounding us in downtown Detroit, I saw people with preexisting conditions. One woman, who was standing on the stage near me, asked me the question: Why is it that I have to worry about whether or not I will be able to get insurance in the future? Why do I have to worry about that?

She added: Why don't President Trump and other Republicans understand this is my life?

It is not political for her. It is personal. It is her life. I think that is a very good question: Why don't Republicans understand that people like Tiffany and those women in pink deserve healthcare protections?

Protecting people with preexisting conditions isn't about politics. It is about saving lives. I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation and the efforts of Senator BALDWIN and JONES.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

Mr. President, I want to take an additional moment to talk about a second issue that is about saving lives.

For almost 25 years, the Violence Against Women Act has helped prevent domestic violence and provide survivors with the things they need to build a better life for themselves and their families. This important piece of legislation is now expired.

The House passed a VAWA—Violence Against Women's Reauthorization bill 48 days ago and sent it to us. It contained important updates to protect people from violent dating partners and stalkers, and it helps restore Tribal jurisdiction over certain crimes committed on Tribal lands.

Unfortunately, just as in the case of junk insurance plans, we have seen no action on this floor—no action—by the majority leader. I think, in fact, it has been over 2 months since we have had actual legislation and votes on legislation that would solve problems and address concerns of the American people. It has been 48 days since the House of Representatives sent us a bill to continue support and funding for domestic violence shelters and other important support.

Well, people with preexisting conditions have waited long enough. Survivors of domestic violence have waited long enough. People whose lives are being threatened by violent dating partners or stalkers have waited long enough.

Here is my question for the Senate majority leader: What are you waiting for?

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BURR. I ask unanimous consent that we start the 4:30 votes now.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Nielson nomination?

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 123 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Alexander	Fischer	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blackburn	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hawley	Roberts
Braun	Hoeven	Romney
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Capito	Inhofe	Rubio
Cassidy	Isakson	Sasse
Cornyn	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Lankford	Shelby
Crapo	Lee	Sullivan
Cruz	McConnell	Thune
Daines	McSally	Toomey
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young

NAYS—47

Baldwin	Hassan	Rosen
Bennet	Heinrich	Sanders
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Booker	Jones	Schumer
Brown	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Sinema
Cardin	Klobuchar	Smith
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Manchin	Tester
Collins	Markey	Udall
Cooms	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warren
Durbin	Murray	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Peters	Wyden
Gillibrand	Reed	

NOT VOTING—2

Harris Tillis

The nomination was confirmed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining votes be 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Stephen R. Clark, Sr., of Missouri, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Clark nomination?

Mr. WICKER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 124 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Alexander	Fischer	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blackburn	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hawley	Roberts
Braun	Hoeven	Romney
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Capito	Inhofe	Rubio
Cassidy	Isakson	Sasse
Collins	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Shelby
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Manchin	Thune
Cruz	McConnell	Toomey
Daines	McSally	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	Young
Ernst	Murkowski	

NAYS—45

Baldwin	Hassan	Rosen
Bennet	Heinrich	Sanders
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Booker	Jones	Schumer
Brown	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Sinema
Cardin	Klobuchar	Smith
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Tester
Cooms	Menendez	Udall
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murphy	Warner
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Feinstein	Peters	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Reed	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Harris Tillis

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Carl J. Nichols, of the District of Columbia, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Nichols nomination?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

This is a 10-minute vote.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 125 Ex.]

YEAS—55

Alexander	Gardner	Perdue
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hawley	Roberts
Boozman	Hoeben	Romney
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Burr	Inhofe	Rubio
Capito	Isakson	Sasse
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Collins	Jones	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Shelby
Cotton	Lankford	Sinema
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Manchin	Thune
Cruz	McConnell	Toomey
Daines	McSally	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	Young
Ernst	Murkowski	
Fischer	Paul	

NAYS—43

Baldwin	Hassan	Sanders
Bennet	Heinrich	Schatz
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schumer
Booker	Kaine	Shaheen
Brown	King	Smith
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cardin	Leahy	Tester
Carper	Markey	Udall
Casey	Menendez	Van Hollen
Coons	Merkley	Warner
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warren
Duckworth	Murray	Whitehouse
Durbin	Peters	Wyden
Feinstein	Reed	
Gillibrand	Rosen	

NOT VOTING—2

Harris	Tillis
--------	--------

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Kenneth D. Bell, of North Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Bell nomination?

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRAUN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 126 Ex.]

YEAS—55

Alexander	Braun	Cornyn
Barrasso	Burr	Cotton
Blackburn	Capito	Cramer
Blunt	Cassidy	Crapo
Boozman	Collins	Cruz

Daines	Kennedy	Rounds
Enzi	Lankford	Rubio
Ernst	Lee	Sasse
Fischer	Manchin	Scott (FL)
Gardner	McConnell	Scott (SC)
Graham	McSally	Shelby
Grassley	Moran	Sinema
Hawley	Murkowski	Sullivan
Hoeben	Paul	Thune
Hyde-Smith	Perdue	Toomey
Inhofe	Portman	Wicker
Isakson	Risch	Young
Johnson	Roberts	
Jones	Romney	

NAYS—43

Baldwin	Hassan	Sanders
Bennet	Heinrich	Schatz
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schumer
Booker	Kaine	Shaheen
Brown	King	Smith
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cardin	Leahy	Tester
Carper	Markey	Udall
Casey	Menendez	Van Hollen
Coons	Merkley	Warner
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warren
Duckworth	Murray	Whitehouse
Durbin	Peters	Wyden
Feinstein	Reed	
Gillibrand	Rosen	

NOT VOTING—2

Harris	Tillis
--------	--------

The nomination was confirmed.
The Senator from Ohio.

TRADE

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I am here on the floor today to talk about international trade. It is a very complex issue, but also a really important issue to our country. Our goal with trade should be pretty simple: It is to level the playing field for America's workers, America's farmers, and America's businesses.

One, we have got to be sure they are not hurt by unfair imports coming into our country, so that is really a fairness issue and a trade enforcement issue.

Second, we should expand our exports. Opening up more foreign markets to our products is great for America. That is the balance. As a trade lawyer and as the U.S. Trade Representative in the George W. Bush administration and as a member of the Finance Committee, which has jurisdiction over these issues, I have worked on the trade matters quite a bit. It is really important to my home State.

Ohio has products that are manufactured by workers and crops grown by our farmers that are shipped all around the world. In fact, in Ohio, 1 of every 3 acres is now planted for export. So our farmers are dependent on trade, and 25 percent of our factory workers—manufacturing workers—have their jobs because of exports. Twenty-five percent is a big part of our manufacturing economy.

These jobs aren't just good for Ohio's economy. They are great for the people that have them. Trade jobs pay, on average, 16 percent more than other jobs, and they have better benefits, so we want more of these jobs.

With 95 percent of the world's population living outside of our country, we want to sell more of our stuff to the rest of the world to continue to grow and maximize the potential of our economy. So in my State and a lot of

others, manufacturing and ag jobs that are the bedrock of our economy depend on balanced trade. That goes for our trading partners around the world, but particularly for our two biggest neighbors: Mexico and Canada. They are, by far, Ohio's biggest trading partners.

Since 1994, we have linked our economy to Mexico and Canada in the form of the North American Free Trade Agreement, or NAFTA. In 2018, Ohio shipped 39 percent of our exports to Canada, more than twice the national average. Along with our trade with Mexico, this accounted for \$20 billion in trade. In all, trade with Mexico and Canada now supports 450,000 jobs in Ohio. So it is important.

We all know that the existing agreement—again, called NAFTA—has to be updated. It is 26 years old. It needs to be modernized. It needs to be improved. We need to be sure that we are doing a better job of leveling that playing field that we talked about and be sure that we are reflecting the nature of the 21st century economy.

Think about it. Back when NAFTA was negotiated, there was no digital economy. So we need to have new rules with regard to digital economy, as we do in our more recent trade agreements.

Also, as an example, there were no biologics. So we have no protections in the NAFTA agreement for biological pharmaceuticals. Of course, we need to have that in the new agreement, but it is more than that. Labor standards and environmental standards that have been in all of the more recent trade agreements need to be incorporated into the NAFTA agreement. There are lots of reasons for us to update the North American Free Trade Agreement and to improve it. Although no trade agreement is perfect, the new USMCA does those things.

By the way, according to a recent study by the Independent Trade Commission, the new USMCA, which is used to replace NAFTA, is estimated to raise wages and add 176,000 jobs to the U.S. economy. That is good. I support this U.S.-Canada agreement, or USMCA.

Last week, President Trump and his administration took a major step toward realizing the USMCA by announcing they would be lifting the so-called section 232 steel tariffs on steel and aluminum coming from Mexico and Canada. This is really good news. It is something I had advocated for, as had others, in order for us to pass the USMCA here but also to be sure that other countries—Canada and Mexico—could ratify the USMCA.

It ends the retaliation by Mexico and Canada on Made in Ohio exports to our northern and southern neighbors. This was really starting to bite in my home State and around the country.

By the way, it also protects against import surges and transshipments, particularly with regard to steel and aluminum. We worry about transshipments coming from China into

countries like Mexico and Canada and then being shipped or sneaked into the United States. You don't want that. That protection is in there as well. I think this was a good agreement.

Tariffs, especially on our allies, ought to be something we try to avoid—used tactically, sparingly, and targeted as to when we are going to use them.

There has been a lot of talk recently about the use of these section 232 tariffs by the administration not just on steel and aluminum but also with regard to automobiles and auto parts. Section 232, the law that this will be done under, is really an exception to our trade laws. Our trade laws say that if you unfairly trade with us—in other words, if you subsidize your products overseas or if you dump them, meaning, you sell them below their cost—then that is illegal, and we get to retaliate by adding tariffs to your product.

We also have laws that say if there is an import surge that domestic industries are substantially harmed by, that is a time for us to step up. But our other trade laws require one of those two things: either a finding of injury to a U.S. industry or some kind of unfair trade.

Under section 232, which is an exception to that, you don't have to do that. You can block imports simply by saying it is a national security issue.

It is a pretty powerful thing that the executive branch has, but it has been used very infrequently, and that is how Congress intended it. Congress intended it just to be used for true national security purposes.

The agency in charge of investigating these 232 tariffs is the Commerce Department. A recent Commerce Department investigation concluded that imported automobiles under the 232 criteria would be a national security threat. I think that is not accurate. I think minivans from Canada, as an example, aren't a national security threat to us. It may be that if they are unfairly traded, then we should enforce our trade laws. It may be that if there is an import surge that hurts our domestic industry, then go after them. But I think to use this tool in that sort of way is not appropriate.

That is why, over the past 50 years since this has been in effect, the section 232 tool has been used only a few times. In fact, it hasn't been used in the last 33 years.

One President tried to use it—George W. Bush, for whom I worked—and his Commerce Department said: You know, that is not a national security issue. So he used another trade provision that, again, required that you showed material injury to a domestic industry. That is the 232 issue.

I think it is important to have the tool. I think if it is a true national security concern, it is good to have it in the toolbox, and we ought to be able to use it. But we have to be judicious about it and not misuse it.

One reason to be careful is if you were to impose tariffs on cars and automobiles, as the Commerce Department has said you could do, it would really cost U.S. consumers and businesses.

First, on average, U.S. cars would cost about \$2,000 more, and I am told that is a conservative estimate. We don't want that.

Second, if you put these 232 tariffs on cars and auto parts with no fairness rationale, the retaliatory tariffs on our exports would be swift and painful.

Finally, if you misuse this 232 tool, I think you risk losing it altogether.

The World Trade Organization might not have too much influence these days, but they do have the ability to say whether something is legal under international trade rules. They have an exception for these national security waivers, but not if they are misused. So I think we have to be careful about how we use it.

President Trump and his administration made a decision over the last several days that I applaud them for. They decided not to move forward on these 232 tariffs against auto parts and automobiles. They decided to put it off for 6 months. I commend them for that.

Again, I hope we would never go there, but I think it is really important that we put that off for 6 months so that we can get not just the U.S.-Canada-Mexico agreement accomplished but so that we can also focus on other things, specifically, our issues with China.

I recently introduced a bipartisan bill on section 232. It is a commonsense approach that says: Let's be sure we are going under the original intent of section 232, that we are not misusing it. It is really simple. It says that instead of having the Department of Commerce make the decision, it should be the Department of Defense. The Department of Defense has the expertise to determine whether something is a national security issue.

With regard to the recent decisions on these 232 tariffs, the Department of Defense did not agree with the Commerce Department and thought that it was not a national security concern. They said that explicitly with regard to steel and aluminum, as examples. I just think the men and women who are hired to protect our country ought to be the ones who decide whether that is a national security threat.

Second, our legislation increases Congress's oversight here and allows for Congress to have an expanded role, to provide a legislative path for Congress to disapprove one of these 232 tariffs decisions if we think it is the wrong way to go. I think it is important to bring some of the power back to Congress, where it resides in the Constitution.

I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will help us with this commonsense legislation and avoid the misuse of section 232 on issues like autos and auto parts.

Again, in the meantime, the administration has made the right choice by delaying the imposition of these 232 tariffs on longtime allies with regard to autos and auto parts.

As I said earlier, balanced trade is about enforcement, being sure that it is fair in terms of what imports are coming into this country for our workers, for our farmers, and for our service providers.

It is also about exports. Do you know what? Because of that goal of balanced trade, I support what the Trump administration is doing vis-a-vis China. Unfortunately, when you look at what has happened to our relationship with China, we have more and more reasons to say that China is not playing by the rules.

China needs to make structural changes in our trade relationship in order for us to have that level playing field we talked about earlier. Right now, this U.S.-China economic relationship lacks equity, balance, and fairness. It also lacks durability.

The big trade deficits and the structural problems we have can't last. To put it simply, China is not playing by the rules.

First, they unfairly subsidized their exports. We talked about this earlier, but it is not fair for another country to say "We are going to use government money to subsidize what we send to the United States," and then have our workers and our farmers have to compete with that. Subsidies are unfair under international rules and under our trade laws.

China does it in a number of ways. One, they have a bunch of State-owned enterprises, and they have actually expanded their State-owned enterprises at a time when it looked as though China was going the other way, that they were going to have a more market-based economy, where the government wouldn't be controlling industries. But they have also committed massive subsidies to some of their favorite industries, companies, and technologies.

Second, China doesn't grant reciprocal access to U.S. investors and engages in coerced technology transfer in intellectual property theft from U.S. companies. Often, that intellectual property or technology then goes to a Chinese company.

To be clear, as a condition of doing business in the huge Chinese market, U.S. companies regularly have to hand over their intellectual property, their technology, and their innovations, like manufacturing processes, let's say, or blueprints, designs, trade secrets, and other things of value. Then, typically, a Chinese competitor uses these advantages to compete against U.S. companies. Again, that is just not acceptable.

I encourage you to check out the administration's section 301 report on USTR.gov. Go on USTR.gov, and you will see the section 301 issues that are laid out in that report. If you want to learn more about it, it is pretty clear.

Let me give you an example of how this technology transfer works. If a U.S. automaker wants to make cars in China—and a lot of them have wanted to and have made them there—China requires joint ventures in order to gain access to production technology that then helps foster China's own domestic auto industry.

In a number of businesses, China requires a 51-percent Chinese partner in a joint venture. Again, that is one way that technology transfer happens.

At first, China's foreign investment catalogue encouraged—that was the word—foreign auto investment. I was in China back in 1984, I believe it was—maybe 1985—at a Jeep plant. And I watched the first American vehicles go off the production line in China. I was there. I saw it. It was very positive. People were thinking: This is interesting. We are going to do business with China. Those Jeeps can then be sold in China and sold in other parts of Asia. It wasn't going to compete with the U.S. market. This was good for Jeep and good for China. That was at a time when they were encouraging foreign auto investment. But as China learned about auto manufacturing from these investments—in other words, they got knowledge about how to manufacture automobiles themselves—the foreign investment catalogue changed its position on auto investment from “encouraged” to “permitted” and then, more recently, in 2015, to “restricted.”

Again, this is an evolution, initially, bringing in a joint venture partner and getting the technology. It goes from “encouraged” to “permitted” and then finally to “restricted” now that China has that technology. That is kind of leapfrogging us, isn't it? Again, that doesn't seem fair, and it certainly is not reciprocal because we don't do the same thing here in this country.

This problem of fueling Chinese innovation with the hard work of U.S. companies is even more pronounced in the electric vehicle sector. There, China tries to incentivize the production of vehicles in China rather than imports from overseas. We would love to sell American electric cars in China, but they prevent this with a combination of things: tariffs, which are relatively high; subsidies for domestically produced electric cars; and a credit system that requires all automakers selling in China to produce a portion of their electric vehicles in China or face penalties. Again, we don't do that.

It is clear from this experience that China's unfair trade practices are at odds with the current rules-based, multilateral trading system.

I will continue to support the administration's efforts to increase pressure on China in order to reach a strong but fair and enforceable agreement. I argue that this is in China's interest, as well as in our interest. They are now a mature trading partner. They are now the greatest exporter in the world. They have an economy that is growing—

again, more sophisticated, more technology. They should want to protect their own intellectual property. They should want to be engaging with us and other countries around the world on a more fair basis.

While I urge the United States to hang tough, the administration should work quickly to try to bring these negotiations to a close because a combination of the retaliatory tariffs on U.S. exports and tariffs on Chinese consumer products here in America is causing pain for our farmers, for our workers, and for our service providers. So it would be good to bring these negotiations to a conclusion.

We were very close to doing that only a few weeks ago, and the reports back were that China had changed its view on some of the concessions they were willing to make. Let's get back to the table, and let's make a fair and enforceable agreement.

As part of increasing pressure on China, as the new tariff increases are designed to do, the United States must also better leverage our allies. The European Union, Japan, Korea, Canada, Australia, not to mention Vietnam and lots of other countries in Southeast Asia—all share our concerns that the administration has raised with regard to China. They are all experiencing the same thing. Leveraging our allies helps put pressure on China by demonstrating the broad consensus that exists among those who believe China often acts contrary to our rules-based, multilateral trading system.

When I was U.S. Trade Representative, I laid the groundwork for a number of successful World Trade Organization complaints against China by working with our allies. Key to our victory in those cases was our ability to rally and to kind of come up with a posse—the EU, Canada, Mexico, Japan, and other countries—to show China that the world was watching and cared. The administration's work with the EU and Japan on WTO reform and subsidies, right now, is a good step in the right direction. It shows how much is possible when we can rely on our friends and, therefore, gain more leverage. It is why it is important we don't adopt policies that actively undermine our ability to work with allies also.

That is another reason I was glad to see the administration delay any tariffs pursuant to this 232 we talked about on automobiles and auto parts. A lot of those 232 tariffs would have been imposed on our allies. Not only do autos and auto parts from our allies or anywhere else in the world not threaten our national security, but it also invites retaliation on U.S. exports and poisons the well of good will we need with our historic allies as we pursue a resolution of our differences with China.

Let me end where we started—about balanced trade. All America needs is a level playing field. We can compete. We have the ability to innovate. We have the ability to be flexible. We have a lot

of advantages in this country, but we do need a level playing field. All we ask for is fair and reciprocal treatment from our trading partners. The sweet spot for America is that balanced approach—again, opening up new markets for U.S. products while insisting on trade enforcement so that our workers can compete.

As we talked about today, right now, we have a lot of balls in the air in relation to trade. This has caused some uncertainty among our trading partners, with American businesses, workers, and farmers that rely on trade. I get that.

Let's prioritize passing USMCA with Canada and Mexico. That will provide some certainty. Let's support the administration in bringing home a strong agreement with China. That will provide a lot of certainty. And let's not impose new section 232 tariffs. That will also provide some certainty and predictability.

With that predictability and certainty further leveling the playing field, we can help American farmers, American workers, American businesses, and our economy.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 23, 2019

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it recess until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, May 23; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IRAN

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, many of us are increasingly concerned that, since President Trump's reckless decision to abandon the multilateral nuclear agreement with Iran, which by all accounts Iran had been complying with, the administration has been on a collision course that could draw us into a war with Iran. Although the President insists that is not what he wants, he is known to change his mind on a whim, and the statements and actions of others in his administration, including some who were vocal proponents of the unnecessary and costly war in Iraq, leave little doubt that they favor a policy of regime change.

We all deplore Iran's support for terrorism, its ballistic missile program, its horrific violations of human rights, and its constant outpouring of hateful

anti-American, anti-Israel rhetoric, but a war with Iran would be far worse, and no one can be certain how it would end. As tensions increase, a misunderstanding or provocative act by either Iran or the United States could quickly trigger retaliatory strikes that spiral out of control, drawing us, our allies, and our adversaries into protracted hostilities. Rather than risk that potentially disastrous result, the administration should be partnering with our European and Middle Eastern allies on a strategy of negotiations to reduce regional tensions. In that regard, I ask unanimous consent that a recent op-ed in "The Guardian" by Peter Westmacott, former British Ambassador to the United States, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Guardian, May 21, 2019]

TO DEFUSE THIS CRISIS THE US MUST START
TALKING TO IRAN

(By Peter Westmacott)

As Washington raises the stakes, the risk of a misunderstanding is high—and it could lead to a new conflict in the Middle East.

Washington's foreign policy hawks—and by extension for the rest of us. Donald Trump says he doesn't want a war with Iran, but his national security adviser, John Bolton, has despatched warships and bombers to the region while the US secretary of state Mike Pompeo has been sharing worrying intelligence about Iranian intentions with close allies and congressional leaders.

What's going on? It's now a year since Trump tore up the nuclear deal with Iran negotiated in 2015 by the Obama administration along with Britain, France, Germany, Russia, China and the EU. Since then, egged on by Israel and the Gulf states, he has announced new sanctions, despite Iran's full compliance with the terms of the deal, and tried bullying the Europeans and others into applying US sanctions in order to deny Iranians the economic benefits they were promised.

After a year of waiting to see if the other signatories would make the deal work without US cooperation, the Iranians announced earlier this month that they would no longer fully comply with the uranium and heavy water restrictions of the agreement—and that, unless the Europeans could help with oil and banking within 60 days, more drastic measures would follow. Western governments sometimes forget that the Iranian government is not a monolithic entity, and that the officials they are used to dealing with, such as president Hassan Rouhani and foreign minister Javad Zarif, are under constant pressure from hardliners who point to the lack of any return on the investment Iran made four years ago.

Since Trump pulled the plug, the Europeans have been working on a scheme to allow some forms of trade with Iran to continue independently of the US. Its effects have been limited, leading the supreme leader, Ali Khamenei, to convince himself—wrongly—that the Europeans were only ever playing good cop to Washington's bad cop. As US sanctions continue to damage the Iranian economy, Trump says he is still interested in some kind of grand bargain. Tehran should call me, the president says, perhaps not realising that there would be huge political consequences for anyone who did.

But outside the US, the impression has grown that the hawks in the Trump adminis-

tration are more interested in regime change than in policy change—and by military action if necessary. There are shades here of Iraq 2003, when the George W Bush administration was desperate to prove that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction. It is nonsense to claim, as Pompeo did last month, that "there is a connection between the Islamic Republic of Iran and al-Qaida. Period. Full stop". Al-Qaida's roots are in Sunni, Wahhabist Saudi Arabia, and it hates Shia Iran almost as much as it hates the US and its allies.

The Europeans have never disagreed about the nature or extent of Iran's destabilising activity in the region. But they don't buy the regime change argument, knowing from experience that outside pressure is more likely to strengthen rather than weaken the hardliners. They also still believe that the best way to prevent Iran acquiring nuclear weapons is to stick with the deal.

There is now a real risk of the world finding itself with another Middle Eastern conflict on its hands, by accident or miscalculation. What can be done? As many of us have been saying to Iranian officials for some time, they should help others to stand up for the nuclear deal by moderating Iran's behaviour in the region: stop supplying sophisticated weaponry to Hezbollah in Lebanon; and stop supplying missiles to the Houthi militia in Yemen that perpetuate the horrific civil war. Iran could use its influence over President Bashar al-Assad to press him to avoid further bloodshed in Syria. And it could end the imprisonment and abuse of dual nationals and other Iranian citizens on specious grounds.

Some suggest that current tensions may be partly the result of misunderstandings between Tehran and Washington. That wouldn't be surprising, given the long history of distrust and the absence of diplomatic relations between the two countries for 40 years. But it serves as a reminder that some form of direct communication is essential: both sides should move quickly to activate private channels.

Back in 1987—when the UN security council was trying to stop the Iran-Iraq war Saddam had started (with western encouragement) seven years earlier—the council passed a resolution calling for an immediate ceasefire and a withdrawal to international borders. It didn't manage to stop Saddam launching another, ultimately unsuccessful offensive. But tucked away in paragraph eight was a request to the secretary general "to examine, in consultation with Iran and Iraq and with other states in the region, measures to enhance the security of the region".

That resolution is still valid. Why not look again at the idea of all the regional powers, under UN auspices, coming together with a view to lowering tensions? A recent OpEd in the New York Times by Abdulaziz Sager, a Saudi Arabian academic, and Hussein Moussavian, a former Iranian nuclear negotiator, argues that the time for the region's two big rivals to sit down and try to bury the hatchet might just have come. So much is at stake that it's surely worth a try.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN PAUL STEVENS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, it has been nearly a decade since Justice John Paul Stevens retired from the Supreme Court. His absence on the bench is perhaps felt more now than ever. Justice Stevens' nomination was the first of 18 Supreme Court nominees I have considered in my years in the Senate. As a young Senator, it was a

privilege to support his confirmation in 1975. It was a vote I have long been proud of. Justice Stevens had a storied tenure on the Supreme Court and ultimately became the third longest serving Justice in our Nation's history.

Justice Stevens' commitment to the law and conduct on the bench was beyond reproach. His legacy is one of integrity, dedication to public service, and a recognition that the Constitution protects all Americans equally. He was part of majorities that protected LGBT rights, disability rights, and limited the death penalty.

The Supreme Court has never been perfect. Justice Stevens would be the first to acknowledge as much, but I cannot help but compare his many years on the Court with today. Today, the Supreme Court almost reflexively sides with corporate interests over individuals' interests, even when precedent or so-called textualism and originalism stand in the way. We have also seen an unprecedented blockade of a Supreme Court nominee, and we have a President intent on nominating the most ideological nominees to the bench I have ever seen, nominees who have been preapproved by opaque far-right special interest groups. Many of these nominees have long records of outright hostility toward reproductive rights, environmental protections, and voting and civil rights. They even refuse to accept that *Brown v. Board of Education*, a foundational civil rights decision settled 65 years ago, is indeed settled law. It is equally predictable and deeply unfortunate that Americans increasingly view the courts as a purely political institution.

Our Constitution and laws are intended to serve the people, protecting the freedom of individuals from the tyranny of government and helping to organize our society for the good of all. It is up to the judiciary to ensure our laws have meaning. This is a duty Justice Stevens' recognized and relished.

How I miss his jurisprudence, his steady voice, and his leadership.

I ask unanimous consent that a May 11, 2019, feature by Robert Barnes from The Washington Post entitled, "John Paul Stevens looks back on nearly a century of life and law, but worries about the future," be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 11, 2019]

JOHN PAUL STEVENS LOOKS BACK ON NEARLY
A CENTURY OF LIFE AND LAW, BUT WORRIES
ABOUT THE FUTURE

(By Robert Barnes)

FORT LAUDERDALE, FL.—John Paul Stevens spent more than a third of his near-century on Earth at the Supreme Court, where he often was on a different page from a majority of his fellow justices.

"It happens so often that you have to get used to losing," Stevens, 99, said during an interview this last week at his condominium here, just steps from the Atlantic Ocean. "My batting average was probably pretty low."

But one particular loss lingers and, Stevens says, brings grim reminders almost weekly: the court's 2008 decision in *District of Columbia v. Heller*, which found the Second Amendment protects a right to individual gun ownership unrelated to possible military service.

"Unquestionably the most clearly incorrect decision that the Court announced during my tenure on the bench," Stevens writes in his new memoir, "The Making of a Justice."

Heller and the Second Amendment, Stevens said in the interview, produce "such disastrous practical effects. I think there's no need for all the guns we have in the country and if I could get rid of one thing it would be to get rid of that whole gun climate."

He continued: "Just the other day there was another school shooting in Colorado, and every time it happens, it seems to me we don't have to have this kind of thing in this country, and we should do everything we can to try to change it."

Stevens writes of his efforts to try to make the 5-to-4 decision come out the other way. His 531-page book, to be published Tuesday, details the life and career of a World War II Navy code-breaker from a solidly Republican family, nominated to the federal bench by one GOP president (Richard M. Nixon) and elevated to the Supreme Court by another (Gerald R. Ford) who retired in 2010 as the court's most outspoken liberal. Although, Stevens believes the court changed more than he did.

In the interview, he expressed generalized distress at the state of the world and the nation's politics. "You wake up in the morning and you wonder what's happened," he said. Still, he retains a judge's reticence even years after leaving the bench: "But I shouldn't say more."

He does wonder why it is so challenging for his former colleagues to recognize that partisan gerrymandering is a constitutional violation, as they do with racial gerrymandering. "It's the same issue," he said. "Public officials, including state legislators, have a duty to act impartially. The whole point [of partisan gerrymandering] is to create an unfair result."

And he expressed surprise about Chief Justice John G. Roberts Jr., whom he respects and admires, "I must confess he's more conservative than I realized," Stevens said. "But that doesn't go to his quality as a chief justice."

During the interview, Stevens was preparing for a reunion of his clerks—more than 90 of 125 were expected to attend. He must steady himself with a walker, but he remains active. Tennis has been replaced by ping-pong, he said, but he still plays nine holes of golf each week.

"I don't go in the ocean as much as I used to, and that's really my favorite activity down here," he said. "A strong guy" to help him in and out of the surf is now "an absolute necessity," he said.

It is hard to imagine that at his 1975 confirmation hearing, soon after he became one of the first to receive a heart bypass operation, the main obstacle was "did I have a sufficient life expectancy to justify the important appointment," he writes. He was approved unanimously. The memoir is a tale of a privileged childhood in Chicago, the ravages of the Great Depression and a family scandal, service as a wartime cryptologist and a charmed legal career as a Supreme Court clerk, appeals court judge and the third-longest-serving justice in the court's history.

Stevens was in the stands at Wrigley Field in Chicago when Babe Ruth called his shot in the 1932 World Series—"my most important

claim to fame," he writes—and in the audience at the Democratic National Convention that summer when Franklin D. Roosevelt explained the New Deal on his way to becoming president. His father, Ernest, who took Stevens to the speech, was a Warren Harding Republican, however.

Amelia Earhart told him he was out too late for a school night when she attended the grand opening of the Stevens Hotel in Chicago, at the time the largest in the world. Charles Lindbergh passed along a caged dove someone had given him. On a trip to the South, Stevens and his family attended "Gone With The Wind" the week it in opened in Atlanta.

The invitations that come to a Supreme Court justice provide other celebrity tidbits. He was as smitten as others when he met Princess Diana, and an encounter with the composer and conductor Leonard Bernstein provides a surprisingly bawdy anecdote from the mannerly Stevens, who often prefaced his questions on the bench with a courtly, "May I just ask . . . ?"

It was during a dinner at the French Embassy in Washington when Stevens and his wife, Maryan, were seated with Bernstein, who had just conducted the Orchestre National de France at the Kennedy Center. Maryan wondered about the emotions that accompany performing a masterpiece.

"It's like [making love] in a cathedral," Bernstein replied, according to Stevens in the memoir. The justice dutifully used the f-word to authenticate his reporting.

"The Making of a Justice" is Stevens's third book since leaving the court; the others chronicle the chief justices with whom he served and how he would remake the Constitution. He said he is unsure if there is a lesson in it for readers. "I didn't have a specific mission in mind, I just started to write," he said.

One lesson from childhood that informed his career, though, involved his father. The Depression hit after the Stevens Hotel opened, and the place faltered. The hotel borrowed money from an insurance company controlled by Stevens's grandfather, an act that a Cook County prosecutor viewed as embezzlement. Ernest Stevens was found guilty, only to have his conviction overturned by the Illinois Supreme Court, which found not a "scintilla" of evidence of criminal intent.

"Firsthand knowledge of the criminal justice's fallibility" made Stevens skeptical for the rest of his career, he said. "The system is not perfect—it's pretty good, but it's not perfect."

Stevens was part of majorities that handed important victories to gays, limited the death penalty and mostly held the line on abortion rights.

On the latter, he said he is puzzled by "more and more state legislatures" passing restrictive laws in hopes of getting the Supreme Court to revisit the court's rulings.

"I thought that was an issue that had been resolved," he said. "I have no idea what the present court will do."

In the book, he detailed his efforts to derail the *Heller* majority. He adopted Justice Antonin Scalia's originalist approach to show, in his opinion, that historical texts supported the view that the Second Amendment was aimed at preventing federal disarmament of state militias, rather than forbidding efforts at gun control.

He wrote that he circulated his dissent five weeks before Scalia's majority opinion, in hopes of persuading Justice Anthony M. Kennedy and—somewhat surprisingly—Justice Clarence Thomas.

"I think he's an intellectually honest person, and I just thought there was a chance he might be persuaded" on the historical argu-

ments, Stevens said of Thomas. "I guess I was kind of dreaming a little bit."

But Stevens said the effort did succeed in getting Kennedy to insist Scalia include limiting language that states and cities have used to defend their gun-control measures.

In the book, Stevens refers to *U.S. v. Nixon*, in which the court said the president must turn over White House tapes to congressional investigators, as "the high point for judicial independence."

He wrote the court's unanimous decision in *Clinton v. Jones*, saying that a sitting president does not have immunity from all civil lawsuits for actions when he was not in office.

Both were unanimous and "easy decisions," Stevens said, but he declined to be drawn into the current battle between congressional investigators and President Trump.

He is asked: Nothing to say about the president? "Nothing that you don't know already," he said.

TRIBUTE TO BISHOP THOMAS C. ELY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to a wonderful friend, Bishop Thomas C. Ely, who is retiring from his leadership position of the Episcopal Diocese of Vermont.

Bishop Ely has been an outstanding servant of the Vermont diocese since his consecration as bishop in 2001. During his tenure in the Green Mountain State, he has served as the leader of the 45 Episcopal congregations in Vermont and one more across Lake Champlain in Essex, NY. He has visited all parishes once a year and counseled many clergy members. Bishop Ely's devotion to human dignity and dignity education influenced every church in the diocese. He demonstrated this as chairman of the board and as an educator of Rock Point School in Burlington, where his wife Ann worked all through his tenure as bishop. Bishop Ely, as a promoter of social justice and equality, also showed leadership in many other ways. He has been active in immigrants' rights, marriage equality, improving the lives of those living in poverty and in Bishops Against Gun Violence. His work on human rights is illustrated in his long commitment to the human rights organization Cristosal, which works in Central America.

Recently, Bishop Ely completed the successful Partnership Campaign for Rock Point, raising over \$2 million to assure the future of the 130 acres owned by the Church on Lake Champlain in Burlington. The funds will improve the trails and facilities in partnership with the city of Burlington and the Lake Champlain Land Trust, preserving 93 acres for public access.

I am proud to say that Bishop Ely lives his faith, through worship, leadership, and through action to improve and enrich the lives of all Vermonters. His journey of faith and action would not have been possible without the love and support of Ann Ely who, in addition to her work at Rock Point School, has also been deeply involved in St. Paul's Cathedral in Burlington.

The outpouring of gratitude and love for Tom and Ann has been enormous, in particular at the May 18, 2019, convention, where Vermont Episcopalians elected their next bishop. The applause would not cease until Bishop Ely motioned for quiet, so that proceedings could continue. Bishop Ely is loved by his people and greatly appreciated by many Vermonters for his principled leadership. He made a difference, helping us to live up to our ideals, and will be fondly remembered, as he and Ann enter a new phase of their lives. Marcelle and I are delighted that Tom and Ann will continue to be citizens of Vermont, living in the beautiful town of Newfane. We both value their friendship.

In honor of Bishop Ely's retirement, I ask that the December 5, 2017, Episcopal New Service article "Vermont Episcopal Bishop Thomas Ely announces plans to retire," be entered into the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Episcopal News Service, Dec. 5, 2017]

**VERMONT EPISCOPAL BISHOP THOMAS ELY
ANNOUNCES PLAN TO RETIRE**

The Right Reverend Thomas C. Ely, tenth bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Vermont, recently announced his intention to retire and resign his ministry, no later than September 30, 2019. He has agreed to remain in his position until a successor is chosen and is in place.

Ely, 65, was consecrated as bishop of the Vermont diocese in 2001, having previously served as a priest in the Diocese of Connecticut for 20 years. In a message to the people of the Diocese of Vermont, Ely said that by the time of his retirement he will have served in the priesthood for nearly 39 years.

"There are other interests and ministries to which I am feeling called to devote my time and energy while my health and stamina are still good," Ely said, "including family, community theatre, various justice ministries and a bit more golf."

During his episcopate, Ely has been a leader both within the diocese and throughout the wider Episcopal Church on such controversial issues as marriage equality, the ordination of LGBT clergy, increased gun safety and racial justice. He is also a leading voice on matters of environmental and economic justice.

As part of his global outreach, Ely serves on the board of Cristosal, a nongovernmental agency based in El Salvador that works to advance human rights in Central America. Additionally, he is a co-founder of the Vermont chapter of Kids4Peace, a grassroots interfaith youth movement dedicated to ending conflict and inspiring hope in Jerusalem and divided societies around the world. More locally, Ely is a leading advocate for the Vermont Ecumenical Council and Vermont Interfaith Action.

Ely has been instrumental in the stewardship and revitalization of Rock Point, a 130-acre property in Burlington, owned by the Vermont diocese, known for its natural beauty and peaceful atmosphere. Each year, nearly 10,000 people visit Rock Point, and Ely is overseeing a \$1.7 million partnership campaign aimed at improving facilities, strengthening leadership and expanding public access.

Ely said that he and his wife, Ann, will take up residence in their house in Newfane, Vermont, upon his retirement. In the meantime, he says, "I plan to use these months ahead to continue encouraging full and passionate engagement in our local mission approaches, and I plan to continue my efforts related to a sustainable Rock Point and all that means to our life as the Episcopal Church in Vermont."

RECOGNIZING DARN TOUGH SOCKS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Darn Tough Vermont says that their factory in Northfield, Vermont, is the "Sock Capital of the World." I'm loath to object to that claim. Over the past 15 years, Darn Tough has steadily grown from a small sock producer for other companies into a world-renowned brand of their own. They've created good paying jobs to Vermont and have a deep commitment to American manufacturing. Darn Tough is a great example of the many hearty small businesses that drive Vermont's economy. It is with pride that I recognize their achievements.

Marc Cabot opened Darn Tough's factory, Cabot Hosiery Mills, in 1978. He started by producing private label socks—other companies sell these under their brand name—for large companies like Brooks Brothers and Old Navy. This was a steady business. But things became difficult in the 1990s when many of those customers began to move their production overseas. By the early 2000s, Cabot Hosiery Mills was struggling.

Marc's son, Ric, who had been involved in the family business from a young age, came up with an idea to save the company. He decided to transition Cabot Hosiery Mills from a private label producer to its own brand: Darn Tough Vermont. Ric envisioned a superior, outdoor-oriented sock that was knit right in Vermont. Its quality would speak for itself.

At first, Ric had to give Darn Tough socks away to get noticed. He gave out 3,500 pairs of Darn Tough socks at the Vermont City Marathon in 2004, and soon after word, began to spread about a mysteriously durable sock with a lifetime warranty produced right in Vermont. Darn Tough's brand and sales have been growing steadily ever since.

Over the past 15 years, the Cabots have rebounded from the brink of bankruptcy to a company nearing \$50 million in sales annually. Ric, who is now the CEO and president, is leading Darn Tough in its latest expansion. They've added over 50 new knitting stations and are in the process of expanding their workforce of over 250 Vermonters. Darn Tough doubled down on American manufacturing when their partners wouldn't—now they're seeing their reward.

I am proud to recognize the contributions and achievements that Darn Tough and the Cabot family has made over their over 40 years in Vermont. I ask consent to enter into the RECORD a VTDigger article titled "Making it in

Vermont: Darn Tough doubles down on Northfield facilities." It describes the hard work that goes into making each Darn Tough sock and highlights Darn Tough's commitment to Vermont and Vermont values.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From VTDigger, March 31, 2019]

**MAKING IT IN VERMONT: DARN TOUGH
DOUBLES DOWN ON NORTHFIELD FACILITIES**

Ask Kirk Smith how many colors of yarn are used at Cabot Hosiery Mills, and he'll tell you: "Too many."

The family-owned factory that produces Darn Tough socks will include up to 16 different threads in a single design. The operation spins out 22,000 pairs of socks every single day.

From the outside, the Northfield production facility isn't much to look at—it's big, beige and unmarked. But inside, thousands of spools of multicolored yarn hang from the ceiling, while computerized machines knit the threads into socks.

"If you had seen me when they took me on my tour when I was being interviewed here, I was like a kid in a candy shop," said Smith, the plant's manager of manufacturing operations. "I didn't want to leave the line. I just wanted to keep seeing what was going on."

Lined up in rows with their electronic displays blinking, the mill's 184 knitting stations resemble slot machines at a casino. But they have a more predictable output: roughly every five minutes, each one dispenses a fresh new sock.

Darn Tough is in the midst of an ambitious five-year expansion plan. In order to increase production, they're adding more machines, bringing their total to 236—for now. Ric Cabot, the company's president and CEO, said those machines will increase the mill's production by 1.5 million pairs of socks per year.

"Accommodating the new equipment required moving their packaging and distribution areas to another building about a mile down the road. That means the company's annual "sock sale"—two weekends in November when locals walk the warehouse looking for deals on factory seconds—will take place at the company's satellite location this year.

There are two sock seasons each year, and the factory works about six months ahead of schedule. Right now, they're mainly producing fall socks.

Each piece is knit, washed, dried, boarded, folded, inspected and packaged in Northfield, before being shipped off to the company's distribution center in Cleveland, Ohio.

"The Cabots have always been very dedicated to their Northfield roots," Smith said. "Could there be better places in the state? Maybe, but this is where they started. This is where they have a connection and this is where we'll be."

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I wish to submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report for May 2019. The report compares current-law levels of spending and revenues with the amounts the Senate agreed to in the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018, BBA18. This information is necessary for the Senate Budget Committee to determine whether budgetary points of order lie against pending legislation.

The Republican staff of the Budget Committee and the Congressional Budget Office, CBO, prepared this report pursuant to section 308(b) of the Congressional Budget Act, CBA.

This is my fourth scorekeeping report this year. My last filing can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 10, 2019. The information included in this report is current through May 20, 2019.

Since my last filing, Congress has cleared only one measure, S. 1436, a bill to make technical corrections to the computation of average pay under Public Law 110-279, with significant budgetary effects. This bill made changes to the calculation of retirement benefits for certain employees who staff the dining services for the U.S. Senate. Those services were privatized in 2008.

Budget Committee Republican staff prepared tables A–C.

Table A gives the amount by which each Senate authorizing committee exceeds or is below its allocation for budget authority and outlays under the fiscal year 2019 enforceable levels filing required by BBA18. This information is used for enforcing committee allocations pursuant to section 302 of the CBA. Over the current 10-year enforceable window, authorizing committees have increased outlays by a combined \$3.4 billion. For this reporting period, 9 of the 16 authorizing committees are not in compliance with their allocations. As a result of passage of S. 1436, the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration is now in violation of its allocation for both budget authority and outlays over the fiscal year 2019–2028 period.

Table B provides the amount by which the Senate Committee on Appropriations is below or exceeds the statutory spending limits. This information is used to determine points of order related to the spending caps found in sections 312 and 314 of the CBA. Appropriations for fiscal year 2019, displayed in this table, show that the Appropriations Committee is compliant with spending limits for the current fiscal year. Those limits for regular discretionary spending are \$647 billion for accounts in the defense category and \$597 billion for accounts in the nondefense category of spending.

The fiscal year 2018 budget resolution contained points of order limiting the use of changes in mandatory programs in appropriations bills, CHIMPs. Table C, which tracks the CHIMP limit of \$15 billion for fiscal year 2019, shows the Appropriations Committee has enacted \$15 billion worth of full-year CHIMPs for this fiscal year.

In addition to the tables provided by Budget Committee Republican staff, I am submitting CBO tables, which I will use to enforce budget totals approved by Congress.

For fiscal year 2019, CBO estimates that current-law levels are \$2.9 billion above and \$3.3 billion below enforceable levels for budget authority and outlays, respectively. Revenues are \$426

million below the level assumed in the budget resolution. Further, Social Security revenues are at the levels assumed for fiscal year 2019, while Social Security outlays are \$4 million above assumed levels for the budget year.

CBO's report also provides information needed to enforce the Senate pay-as-you-go, PAYGO, rule. The PAYGO scorecard shows deficit increases in fiscal year 2019 of \$1,957 million, \$427 million revenue loss, \$1,530 million outlay increase; over the fiscal year 2018–2023 period of \$3,373 million, \$894 million revenue loss, \$2,479 million outlay increase; and over the fiscal year 2018–2028 period of \$443 million, \$634 million revenue loss, \$191 million outlay decrease.

This submission also includes a table tracking the Senate's budget enforcement activity on the floor since the enforcement filing on May 7, 2018. Since my last report, no new budgetary points of order were raised.

All years in the accompanying tables are fiscal years.

I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying tables be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE A.—SENATE AUTHORIZING COMMITTEES—ENACTED DIRECT SPENDING ABOVE (+) OR BELOW (–) BUDGET RESOLUTIONS

(In millions of dollars)				
	2019	2019–2023	2019–2028	
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry				
Budget Authority	2,414	4,249	3,123	
Outlays	1,401	1,797	70	
Armed Services				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	
Outlays	0	0	0	
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs				
Budget Authority	21	285	382	
Outlays	20	285	382	
Commerce, Science, and Transportation				
Budget Authority	41	77	91	
Outlays	11	74	90	
Energy and Natural Resources				
Budget Authority	0	–10	–24	
Outlays	0	–10	–24	
Environment and Public Works				
Budget Authority	2	4	–333	
Outlays	2	4	–333	
Finance				
Budget Authority	378	1,128	–889	
Outlays	159	1,120	–892	
Foreign Relations				
Budget Authority	0	–5	–20	
Outlays	0	–5	–20	
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs				
Budget Authority	0	2	4	
Outlays	43	48	49	
Judiciary				
Budget Authority	13	209	497	
Outlays	13	205	492	
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions				
Budget Authority	0	–36	–84	
Outlays	0	–36	–84	
Rules and Administration				
Budget Authority	0	0	1	
Outlays	0	0	1	
Intelligence				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	
Outlays	0	0	0	
Veterans' Affairs				
Budget Authority	4	3	–729	
Outlays	4,402	4,400	3,668	
Indian Affairs				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	
Outlays	0	0	0	
Small Business				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	
Outlays	0	0	0	
Total				
Budget Authority	2,873	5,906	2,019	
Outlays	6,051	7,882	3,399	

TABLE B.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED REGULAR DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS ¹

(Budget authority, in millions of dollars)

	2019	
	Security ²	Nonsecurity ²
Statutory Discretionary Limits	647,000	597,000
Amount Provided by Senate Appropriations Subcommittee		
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0	23,042
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	5,499	58,619
Defense	606,340	129
Energy and Water Development	22,440	22,200
Financial Services and General Government	31	23,392
Homeland Security	2,058	47,353
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0	35,552
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies	0	178,076
Legislative Branch	0	4,836
Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	10,332	86,804
State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0	46,218
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	300	70,779
Current Level Total	647,000	597,000
Total Enacted Above (+) or Below (–) Statutory Limits	0	0

¹ This table excludes spending pursuant to adjustments to the discretionary spending limits. These adjustments are allowed for certain purposes in section 251(b)(2) of BBEDCA.

² Security spending is defined as spending in the National Defense budget function (050) and nonsecurity spending is defined as all other spending.

TABLE C.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAMS (CHIMPS)

(Budget authority, millions of dollars)

2019	
CHIMPS Limit for Fiscal Year 2019	15,000
Senate Appropriations Subcommittees	
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	7,285
Defense	0
Energy and Water Development	0
Financial Services and General Government	0
Homeland Security	0
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies	7,715
Legislative Branch	0
Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0
State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0
Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0
Current Level Total	15,000
Total CHIMPS Above (+) or Below (–) Budget Resolution	0

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, May 22, 2019.

Hon. MIKE ENZI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2019 budget and is current through May 20, 2019. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels printed in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2018, pursuant to section 30103 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–123).

Since our last letter dated April 10, 2019, the Congress has not cleared any legislation for the President's signature that affects budget authority, outlays, or revenues in fiscal year 2019.

Sincerely,

MARK P. HADLEY
(For Keith Hall, Director).

Enclosure.

TABLE 1.—SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019, AS OF MAY 20, 2019

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget Resolution	Current Level	Current Level Over/Under (–) Resolution
On-Budget:			
Budget Authority	3,639.3	3,642.2	2.9
Outlays	3,550.0	3,546.7	–3.3
Revenues	2,590.5	2,590.1	–0.4

TABLE 1.—SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019, AS OF MAY 20, 2019—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget Resolution	Current Level	Current Level Over/Under (–) Resolution
Off-Budget:			
Social Security Outlays ^a	908.8	908.8	0.0
Social Security Revenues	899.2	899.2	0.0

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

^aExcludes administrative expenses paid from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget, but are appropriated annually.

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019, AS OF MAY 20, 2019

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted: ^{a,b,c}			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,590,496
Permanents and other spending legislation	2,271,360	2,169,258	n.a.
Authorizing and Appropriation legislation	1,886,507	1,949,120	–302
Offsetting receipts	–890,012	–890,015	n.a.
Total, Previously Enacted	3,267,855	3,228,363	2,590,194
Enacted Legislation:			
Authorizing Legislation			
Medicaid Extenders Act of 2019 (P.L. 116–3)	120	8	0
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019 (P.L. 116–6, Division H) ^d	2	2	1
Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2018 (P.L. 116–8)	0	–5	0
Medicaid Services Investment and Accountability Act of 2019 (P.L. 116–16)	52	32	0
Subtotal, Authorizing Legislation	174	37	1
Appropriation Legislation: ^b			
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019 (Divisions A–G, P.L. 116–6) ^{b,c}	480,297	311,586	–125
Total, Enacted Legislation	480,471	311,623	–124
Entitlements and Mandatories	–106,128	6,756	0
Total Current Level ^c	3,642,198	3,546,742	2,590,070
Total Senate Resolution ^c	3,639,324	3,550,009	2,590,496
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	2,874	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	n.a.	3,267	426
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2019–2028:			
Senate Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	33,272,518
Senate Resolution ^c	n.a.	n.a.	33,273,213
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	695

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

^a Includes the budgetary effects of legislation enacted by Congress during the 115th Congress.

^b Sections 1001–1004 of the 21st Century Cures Act (P.L. 114–255) require that certain funding provided for 2017 through 2026 to the Department of Health and Human Services—in particular the Food and Drug Administration and the National Institutes of Health—be excluded from estimates for the purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Deficit Control Act) or the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Congressional Budget Act). Therefore, the amounts shown in this report do not include \$771 million in budget authority, and \$767 million in estimated outlays.

^c For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the Senate, the resolution, as approved by the Senate, does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level does not include those items.

^d The Continuing Appropriations Act, 2019 (P.L. 116–5), as amended, extended several immigration programs through February 15, 2019, that would otherwise have expired at the end of fiscal year 2018. The estimated budgetary effects of those previously enacted extensions are charged to the Committee on Appropriations, and are included in the budgetary effects of P.L. 116–6 shown in the “Appropriation Legislation” portion of this report. In addition, division H of P.L. 116–6 further extended those same programs through the end of fiscal year 2019. Consistent with the language in title III of division H of P.L. 116–6, and at the direction of the Senate Committee on the Budget, the budgetary effects of extending those immigration programs for the remainder of the fiscal year are charged to the relevant authorizing committees, and are shown in the “Authorizing Legislation” portion of this report.

^e Section 30103 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 requires the Chair of the Senate Committee on the Budget publish the aggregate spending and revenue levels for fiscal year 2019; those aggregate levels were first published in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2018. The Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 also allows the Chair of the Senate Committee on the Budget to revise the budgetary aggregates:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Original Aggregates Printed on May 7, 2018:	3,547,094	3,508,052	2,590,496
Revisions:			
Pursuant to sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974	921	0	0
Pursuant to sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974	69,464	38,556	0
Pursuant to sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974	0	–214	0
Pursuant to sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974	1,680	25	0
Pursuant to sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974	20,165	3,590	0
Revised Senate Resolution	3,639,324	3,550,009	2,590,496

TABLE 3.—SUMMARY OF THE SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD AS OF MAY 20, 2019

[In millions of dollars]

	2018	2019	2018–2023	2018–2028
Beginning Balance ^a	0	0	0	0
Enacted Legislation: ^{b,c}				
A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to “Incident Auto Lending and Compliance with the Equal Credit Opportunity Act” (S.J. Res. 57, P.L. 115–172)	*	*	*	*
Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protections Act (S. 2155, P.L. 115–174) ^d	*	22	329	490
Trickett Wendler, Frank Mongiello, Jordan McLinn, and Matthew Bellina Right to Try Act of 2017 (S. 204, P.L. 115–176)	*	*	*	*
An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish assistance for adaptations of residences of veterans in rehabilitation programs under chapter 31 of such title, and for other purposes (H.R. 3562, P.L. 115–177)	*	*	*	*
VA MISSION Act of 2018 (S. 2372, P.L. 115–182) ^c	*	*	*	*
Whistleblower Protection Coordination Act (S. 1869, P.L. 115–192)	*	*	*	*
All Circuit Review Act (H.R. 2229, P.L. 115–195)	*	*	*	*
American Innovation \$1 Coin Act (H.R. 770, P.L. 115–197)	0	3	3	0
Small Business 7(a) Lending Oversight Reform Act of 2018 (H.R. 4743, P.L. 115–189)	*	*	*	*
Northern Mariana Islands U.S. Workforce Act of 2018 (H.R. 5956, P.L. 115–218)	0	0	0	–3
KIWI Act (S. 2245, P.L. 115–226)	*	*	*	*
To make technical amendments to certain marine fish conservation statutes, and for other purposes (H.R. 4528, P.L. 115–228)	*	*	*	*
John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (H.R. 5515, P.L. 115–232)	*	*	*	*
Miscellaneous Tariff Bill Act of 2018 (H.R. 4318, P.L. 115–239)	0	304	690	–118
Tribal Social Security Fairness Act of 2018 (H.R. 6124, P.L. 115–243)	0	*	–1	–3
Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2019 (H.R. 6157, Division B, P.L. 115–245, Division B)	0	0	18	18
Nuclear Energy Innovation Capabilities Act of 2017 (S. 97, P.L. 115–248)	*	*	*	*
Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2018 (S. 3479, P.L. 115–251)	*	2	*	–3

TABLE 3.—SUMMARY OF THE SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD AS OF MAY 20, 2019—Continued
(In millions of dollars)

	2018	2019	2018– 2023	2018– 2028
Elkhorn Ranch and White River National Forest Conveyance Act of 2017 (H.R. 698, P.L. 115–252)	*	*	*	*
FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018 (H.R. 302, P.L. 115–254) ^a	*	44	42	26
Patient Right To Know Drug Act of 2018 (S. 2554, P.L. 115–263)	*	*	–11	–52
Orrin G. Hatch–Bob Goodlatte Music Modernization Act (H.R. 1551, P.L. 115–264)	0	0	13	–24
Congressional Award Program Reauthorization Act of 2018 (S. 3509, P.L. 115–268)	0	*	2	4
America’s Water Infrastructure Act of 2018 (S. 3021, P.L. 115–270)	0	2	16	–230
SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act (H.R. 6, P.L. 115–271) ^a	0	*	*	*
Hizballah International Financing Prevention Amendments Act of 2017 (S. 1595, P.L. 115–272)	0	*	*	*
To authorize the National Emergency Medical Services Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes (H.R. 1037, P.L. 115–275)	0	*	*	*
Gulf Islands National Seashore Land Exchange Act (H.R. 2615, P.L. 115–279)	0	*	*	*
Frank LoBiondo Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2018 (S. 140, P.L. 115–282)	0	10	34	0
Making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes (H.J. Res. 143, P.L. 115–298)	0	*	*	*
Amy, Vicky, and Andy Child Pornography Victim Assistance Act of 2018 (S. 2152, P.L. 115–299)	0	*	*	*
A bill to establish a procedure for the conveyance of certain Federal property around the Dickinson Reservoir in the State of North Dakota (S. 440, P.L. 115–306)	0	0	0	–4
A bill to establish a procedure for the conveyance of certain Federal property around the Jamestown Reservoir in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes (S. 2074, P.L. 115–308)	0	0	0	–7
Anwar Sadat Centennial Celebration Act (H.R. 754, P.L. 115–310)	0	*	*	*
Larry Doby Congressional Gold Medal Act (H.R. 1861, P.L. 115–322)	0	*	*	*
Reciprocal Access to Tibet Act of 2018 (H.R. 1872, P.L. 115–330)	0	*	*	*
Protecting Access to the Courts for Taxpayers Act (H.R. 3996, P.L. 115–332)	0	*	*	*
Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 (H.R. 2, P.L. 115–334)	0	1,399	1,785	0
Nicaragua Human Rights and Anticorruption Act of 2018 (H.R. 1918, P.L. 115–335)	0	*	*	*
21st Century Integrated Digital Experience Act (H.R. 5759, P.L. 115–336)	0	*	*	*
Chinese–American World War II Veteran Congressional Gold Medal Act (S. 1050, P.L. 115–337)	0	*	*	*
USS Indianapolis Congressional Gold Medal Act (S. 2101, P.L. 115–338)	0	*	*	*
Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame Commemorative Coin Act (H.R. 1235, P.L. 115–343)	0	0	0	0
Sanctioning the Use of Civilians as Defenseless Shields Act (H.R. 3342, P.L. 115–348)	0	*	*	*
Correcting Miscalculations in Veterans’ Pensions Act (H.R. 4431, P.L. 115–352)	0	*	*	*
Strengthening Coastal Communities Act of 2018 (H.R. 5787, P.L. 115–358)	0	*	*	*
Walnut Grove Land Exchange Act (H.R. 5923, P.L. 115–361)	0	*	*	*
To amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to extend through 2023 the authority of the Federal Election Commission to impose civil money penalties on the basis of a schedule of penalties established and published by the Commission (H.R. 7120, P.L. 115–386)	0	*	*	*
First Step Act of 2018 (S. 756, P.L. 115–391)	0	11	120	317
Abolish Human Trafficking Act of 2017 (S. 1311, P.L. 115–392)	0	*	*	*
CENOTE Act of 2018 (S. 2511, P.L. 115–394)	0	*	*	*
NASA Enhanced Use Leasing Extension Act of 2018 (S. 7, P.L. 115–403)	0	0	5	5
Veterans Benefits and Transition Act of 2018 (S. 2248, P.L. 115–407)	0	*	*	*
Stephen Michael Gleason Congressional Gold Medal Act (S. 2652, P.L. 115–415)	0	*	*	*
Veterans Small Business Enhancement Act of 2018 (S. 2679, P.L. 115–416)	0	*	*	*
Forever GI Bill Housing Payment Fulfillment Act of 2018 (S. 3777, P.L. 115–422)	0	*	*	*
National Integrated Drought Information System Reauthorization Act of 2018 (S. 2200, P.L. 115–423)	0	*	*	*
To authorize early repayment of obligations to the Bureau of Reclamation within the Northport Irrigation District in the State of Nebraska (H.R. 4689, P.L. 115–429)	0	*	*	*
75th Anniversary of World War II Commemoration Act (S. 3661, P.L. 115–433)	0	*	*	*
Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program Extension Act (H.R. 251, P.L. 116–2)	0	*	*	*
Medicaid Extenders Act of 2019 (H.R. 259, P.L. 116–3)	0	8	63	*
Further Additional Continuing Appropriations Act, 2019 (H.J. Res. 28, P.L. 116–5)	0	*	*	*
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019 (H.J. Res. 31, P.L. 116–6) ^b	0	125	229	9
Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2018 (S. 483, P.L. 116–8)	0	–5	–23	0
John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act (S. 47, P.L. 116–9)	0	0	–10	–10
Medicaid Services Investment and Accountability Act of 2019 (H.R. 1839, P.L. 116–16)	0	32	69	27
Target Practice and Marksmanship Training Support Act (H.R. 1222, P.L. 116–17)	0	*	*	*
An act to make technical corrections to the computation of average pay under Public Law 110–279 (S. 1436)	0	*	*	1
Impact on Deficit	*	1,957	3,373	443
Total Change in Outlays	*	1,530	2,479	–191
Total Change in Revenues	*	–427	–894	–634

Source: Congressional Budget Office.
Notes: P.L. = Public Law, * = between –\$500,000 and \$500,000.
^a On May 7, 2018, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget reset the Senate’s Pay-As-You-Go Scorecard to zero for all fiscal years.
^b The amounts shown represent the estimated effect of the public laws on the deficit.
^c Excludes off-budget amounts.
^d Pursuant to section 232(b) of H.C. Res. 290 (106th Congress), the Concurrent Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2001, the budgetary effects related to the Federal Reserve’s surplus funds are excluded. As a result, the amounts shown do not include estimated increases in revenues of \$655 million in fiscal year 2019, \$570 million over the 2019–2023 period, and \$454 million over the 2019–2028 period.
^e The budgetary effects of this Act are excluded from the Senate’s PAYGO scorecard, pursuant to section 512 of the Act.
^f Division I of P.L. 115–254 contains the Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Act, 2018, which provided \$1.680 million in supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2019, and designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251 of the Deficit Control Act. At the direction of the Committees on the Budget, and consistent with the language in section 1701, those amounts are shown as discretionary spending.
^g The budgetary effects of this Act are excluded from the Senate’s PAYGO scorecard, pursuant to section 8231 of the Act.
^h The budgetary effects of title I of division H are excluded from the Senate’s PAYGO scorecard, pursuant to title III of division H of the Act.

ENFORCEMENT REPORT OF POINTS OF ORDER RAISED SINCE THE FY 2019 ENFORCEMENT FILING

Vote	Date	Measure	Violation	Motion to Waive	Result
127	June 18, 2018	H.R. 5515—John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019.	4106(a)–Senate-Pay-As-You-Go Violation ¹	Sen. McConnell (R–KY) ²	81–14, waived
192	August 23, 2018	S. Amdt. #3695 to H.R. 6157, the Defense, Labor, HHS, and Education Appropriations Act ³ .	314(a) CHIMP with Net-Costs	Sen. Leahy (D–VT)	68–24, waived

¹ Senator Sanders raised a section 4106(a) of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress) point of order against the bill because the bill would increase the on-budget deficit.
² By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to a roll call vote to waive the point of order.
³ This surgical point of order would have struck lines 7–8 of page 270 in Division B (Title III) of the substitute amendment, which was related to the Pell Grant program. This provision was a Change in Mandatory Program (CHIMP) estimated to increase spending by \$390 million over 10 years.

SRI LANKA

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, this week marks the 10th anniversary of the end of Sri Lanka’s decades-long civil war. On May 19, 2009, Sri Lanka’s 26-year conflict between the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam, LTTE, and the government of Sri Lanka came to a close with the LTTE’s military defeat and surrender. This anniversary comes on the heels of the horrible Easter Sunday terrorist attacks on churches across Sri Lanka for which we are still seeking answers and accountability from ISIS and its affiliates on the island.

While the end of the war was a counterterrorism victory, we have since learned the ugly cost of this effort. According to International Crisis Group, in the final months of Sri Lanka’s civil war, Sri Lankan Government “attacks on its own self-declared ‘no-fire zones’ killed tens of thousands of [Tamil] civilians . . . claims range from 7,000 to 147,000 dead.” For several years, I have been calling for an international, independent mechanism to investigate allegations of war crimes and crimes against humanity committed during the Sri Lankan conflict.

I also remain concerned about recent violations of human rights and religious freedom in that country.

Since the end of the war, there has yet to be real progress made on reconciliation and accountability for Tamils through domestic processes, as recommended by the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights 2015 Investigation on Sri Lanka, OISL. Human rights violations against Tamil, Christian, and Muslim minorities continue, and the Sri Lankan Government has

failed to bring to justice the perpetrators of attacks against journalists, religious, and ethnic minorities and opposition politicians.

Sri Lanka has a long way to go on its path to reconciliation. In addition to pursuing meaningful justice and accountability, the Sri Lankan Government must implement comprehensive security sector reform, fully operationalize the Office of Missing Persons to provide families with answers on what happened to their loved ones, repeal the controversial Prevention of Terrorism Act, PTA, release political prisoners as called for by our own State Department and required by fiscal year 2019 Appropriations bill and address the root causes of the civil war and the government's responsibility to protect citizens of all communities.

Concerns over intercommunal strife are exacerbated by the horrific April 21 Easter attacks on churches and hotels across the island that killed over 200 civilians. We are learning that ISIS-affiliated entities were behind the attacks. As Sri Lanka deals with the very new threat of Islamic extremism, it is critical that its government not repeat its pattern of suppressing media, civil society, and religious freedom under the veil of counterterrorism. The government's abuse of emergency powers, recent ban on Muslim face-covers, coupled with retaliatory attacks against mosques and Muslim businesses with little response from Sri Lanka law enforcement is problematic and only serves to heighten tensions between religious and ethnic communities. I urge the Sri Lankan security forces to exercise restraint in their response to the Easter attacks.

While horrific on their own, the Easter attacks were a stark reminder that, as we come upon the 10th anniversary of the end of Sri Lanka's civil war, intercommunal conflict remains a reality on the island. The Sri Lankan Government's response to the Easter attacks echoes of the country's history of conflict and oppression under cover of counterterrorism. As we remember and commemorate the tens of thousands of lives lost leading up to May 2009, I urge Sri Lanka, the United States and the international community to continue to pursue justice, accountability, and reconciliation for a war-torn nation.

REMEMBERING ELLEN TAUSCHER

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I wish to speak about the wonderful spirit and dedication of Ellen Tauscher, who was taken from us far too early on April 29, 2019. She was a one of a kind of person and very special to me.

Ellen is survived by her daughter Katherine, who is an amazing young woman. I have seen her through some of the most difficult days and she has an equanimity and an ability second to none. Ellen's sisters Sally and Kathy and brother Jack provided very strong

family support to her, especially at the end. She is truly loved.

Ellen touched so many lives, and anybody who has worked with her, had dinner with her, drank a little California wine with her knows the special person she is.

Ellen was one of the first women and the youngest woman ever at the age of 25 to become a member of the New York Stock Exchange in 1977.

I was president of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors at that time, and I can tell you, being a woman on the Stock Exchange at that time was a very big deal.

Ellen was to go on to work in finance for 14 years as a successful investment banker and bond trader.

A few years after she moved west, Ellen gave birth to her pride and joy, the wonderful Katherine Tauscher. As a new mother herself, Ellen struggled to find good childcare, and she used that experience to create the ChildCare Registry, a service to help parents check backgrounds of childcare centers.

You see, that was how she was. When she saw a problem, she worked out a solution. When Ellen Tauscher put her mind to something, there was no stopping her. Achievement was a given.

Ellen ran for a seat in Congress in 1996. The newly created district was conservative, and few people thought it would go to a Democrat, but Ellen appealed to moderates on both sides of the aisle, and success, I always thought, was a given. She went on to win that seat and hold it for 12 years.

As a Member of Congress, Ellen made a name for herself as a centrist, someone who could work both sides of the aisle. Her colleagues, many of whom attended the memorial service earlier this week at the National Cathedral, knew she would always do what was best for her district and for the country.

Ellen sat on the House Armed Services Committee and became chair of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee. Not necessarily what you would expect from an elementary education major from New Jersey, but Ellen was a real force.

She developed an expertise and substantial knowledge in arms control, nonproliferation, and nuclear weapons. It was a good fit since her district was home to Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

That expertise and the ability to be effective in a critically important post was a big reason why then-Secretary of State Clinton selected her and President Obama nominated her to be Undersecretary of State for Arms Control and International Security.

One of Ellen's biggest accomplishments in that role was shepherding the negotiations over the New START Treaty and helping with its ratification through the Senate in 2010.

As a matter of fact, it was at her suggestion that former Senator Jon Kyl and I went to Geneva under the aus-

pices of the Senate National Security Working Group to observe the negotiations and meet with the Russian and U.S. delegations. Ellen was so proud of the treaty, and so are we.

She proved just how strong she was during this most difficult period. She did much of her work on the treaty while suffering from esophageal cancer, but she never let it slow her down. When she retired from the Federal Government, a new world would open.

She was appointed by Governor Jerry Brown to the University of California Board of Regents, she chaired California's Military Advisory Council, and she served as vice chair of the Atlantic Council's Scowcroft Center for Strategy and Security.

Just last year, she showed she was still a player in California politics, working with Katie Merrill to create a Political Action Committee called Fight Back, and that was just what Ellen did.

Ellen was brilliant. She was warm and loyal to her country, her family, and her friends, and she had a wonderful sense of humor. I saw this constantly over a glass of wine and dinner in Washington. She was always ready with something that made friends smile and even laugh.

She was, for me, a best friend, and that will never change. Thank you.

TRIBUTE TO LAWRENCE E. HENNING

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor an American hero who served bravely in the European Campaign of the Second World War.

Lawrence E. Henning of Great Falls, MT, served in the Third Army under the command of General George S. Patton. He marched with thousands of Allied troops across the Continent, through France, Luxembourg, Belgium, and finally into Germany, deploying his expertise of the tank destroyer in the final, decisive year of the war.

Lawrence's courage and ingenuity were critical to the effort. His resourcefulness allowed the battalion to maintain a maximum number of tank destroyers on the front line. His skills and bravery on the battlefield earned him commendations decades ago; it is my honor to finally deliver them today.

I am proud to present you, Lawrence, with the Bronze Star Medal for your Meritorious Service in connection with military operations against an enemy of the United States in France, Luxembourg, Belgium, and Germany during the period 15 September 1944 to 30 March 1945.

I am also presenting you with: the American Defense Service Medal, the European-African-Middle Eastern Campaign Medal with 3 Bronze Service Stars; the World War II Victory Medal; and the Honorable Service Lapel Button—World War II.

These medals are a small token of our nation's appreciation for your service and your sacrifice.

Lawrence, you are an American hero, and Montana is proud to call you one of our own.

NATIONAL SEERSUCKER DAY

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, today I rise in recognition of seersucker manufacturers and enthusiasts across the United States. I wish everyone a Happy National Seersucker Day. This uniquely American fashion has a storied history dating back to 1909. Louisiana is proud to have played an important part in introducing the country to seersucker apparel. The first seersucker suit was designed by Joseph Haspel at his Broad Street facility in New Orleans, LA.

This lightweight cotton fabric, known for its signature pucker, has been worn and enjoyed by Americans across the country during the hot summer months. Mr. Haspel said it best, "Hot is hot, no matter what you do for a living." In the 1990s, Seersucker Day was established by Members of this Chamber to honor this unique American fashion. I proudly resumed this tradition in 2014 in the U.S. House of Representatives by designating Wednesday, June 11, as National Seersucker Day. I have continued this tradition in the U.S. Senate and wish to designate Thursday, June 13, as the sixth annual National Seersucker Day. I encourage everyone to wear seersucker on this day to commemorate this iconic American clothing.

TRIBUTE TO UTAH'S SERVICE ACADEMY APPOINTEES

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, it is that time of year where I am privileged to recognize exceptional young men and women from the great State of Utah who have answered the call to serve by applying to the U.S. Air Force Academy, the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, the U.S. Military Academy, and the U.S. Naval Academy. It is one of my greatest honors to recognize these fine Utahns in the U.S. Senate.

Under title 10 of the U.S. Code, each year, Members of Congress are authorized to nominate a number of young men and women from their district or State to attend the country's service academies. Each of these students is of sound mind and body. This will serve them well in Colorado Springs, Kings Point, West Point, and Annapolis, but to succeed, they will need more than this.

The journey on which these young men and women will soon embark requires more than mental and physical aptitude. It also demands strong moral character: leadership, courage, honesty, prudence, and self-discipline. It calls for a commitment to service and a love of country. Ultimately, it provides a chance for some of Utah's finest to stand up for our country.

Today, I would like to congratulate each of these impressive students, all of whom embody, in their own unique

way, the standards of excellence upon which America's service academies are built.

Carson James Angerth will be attending the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy after graduating from Cottonwood High School, where he was part of the State champion baseball team. He served as a church camp counselor for 3 years and served his neighbors by helping them clean and renovate their homes. As a leader in the youth organization through his church, he is as an example for his peers. He is often found outdoors hiking, biking, and skiing.

Jackson Thomas DuPaix accepted an appointment to the U.S. Naval Academy. He earned his diploma a year early from Rockbridge County High School and has been attending Southern Virginia University. An Eagle Scout from Riverton, UT, he was part of his high school's drone club and lacrosse team. He served as president of his church youth group and stayed active in his community by helping with home renovations, city landscaping projects, and putting together Christmas boxes of food and toys.

Cassidy Ann Eiting is following in her father's footsteps and attending the U.S. Air Force Academy. After graduating from South Summit High School, she attended the Northwestern Preparatory School. She was a leader in high school as the student body vice president, captain of both her swimming and soccer teams, and a member of the two-time State champion softball team. Inspired by her mother, a commissioned Air Force officer, she stayed active in her school and community as a member of the MiteE Team, Interact Club, and National Honor Society.

Jacob Joseph Frederick, the student body president of Skyline High School, will follow his father to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. He attended Boys State and earned his Eagle Scout Award, while being active on the basketball and lacrosse teams. Building his leadership skills, Jacob served as first chair trumpet for the concert band and jazz band, coach of a youth basketball team, and as a summer camp counselor. He worked on projects benefiting veterans at the Fisher House in Salt Lake City.

Christina Gillespie accepted an appointment to the U.S. Air Force Academy, joining a long family tradition of Air Force service. She graduated from Clearfield High School where she maintained a 4.0 GPA and captained the swimming team, earning the MVP title twice. She served as president of her church youth group and as the student body officer over service, where her school raised \$50,000 for local charities. A member of the school choir, Christina is also a member of the Oratorio Society of Utah, a nondenominational choral organization.

Enoch Austin Horning, a member of the Utah Army National Guard, will be continuing his service at the U.S. Military

Academy at West Point after having attended the Military Academy's preparatory school. He served as the student body president of the Utah Military Academy, where he was captain of the Ranger Team. Enoch was awarded the JROTC Cadet of the Year Award, earned his Eagle Scout Award, and attended Boys State. He served in the Civil Air Patrol, as president of the Strategic Gaming Club, and as a member of the Cyber Patriots.

Camryn Lynlee Karras, from Weber High School, accepted an appointment to the U.S. Air Force Academy. An outstanding soccer player, Camryn captained both her high school team and her national league club team. She is a member of the National Honor Society, the Robotics Club, and Health Occupations Students of America—HOSA. Each year at Christmastime, she looks forward to providing gifts and breakfast to the Boys and Girls Club in her community.

Spencer Burnett Knudsen will be joining a family history of Army service when he attends the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. He is already building his leadership credentials as the student body president of Monticello High School, captain of the basketball team, and head lifeguard for the city of Monticello. Spencer is a member of the National Honor Society, the Future Business Leaders of America—FBLA—and serves his community as a volunteer EMT with San Juan County.

Karsten Korb Matosich will be attending the U.S. Military Academy at West Point after graduating from Bingham High School. An Eagle Scout, Karsten serves his community as an organist for his church and at local retirement homes, winterizing homes on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, and coordinating the assembly and donation of hundreds of oral hygiene kits. He served as cocaptain of his debate team and played in the Bingham Symphony.

Levi Daniel Montoya will be attending the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. As a graduate of Juan Diego Catholic High School, Levi stayed busy as the team captain of both his high school and club lacrosse teams. A member of the National Honor Society, he also was a member of the Key Club, Pre-med Club, and the Boy Scouts. Levi was inspired to attend West Point by his father and grandfather, both Army soldiers, who told the stories of his great-grandfather, Army Medic Albert Montoya, who served valiantly on the beaches of Normandy on June 6, 1944.

Samuel Austin Nafus, who was offered multiple academy appointments, has chosen to follow his brother to the U.S. Naval Academy. A member of the State champion academic olympiad team for Bountiful High School, Sam also participated in DECA, debate, and Model UN. He maintained a 4.0 GPA while being active in his community as a lector for Saint Olaf Catholic Church,

attending Boys State, and earning his Eagle Scout Award. Sam received varsity letters for both football and track.

Jaxon Jefferson Porter will be attending the U.S. Military Academy at West Point after having served for 2 years as a missionary for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Armenia. Jaxon graduated from Weber High School in 2016, where he challenged himself by taking a difficult course load of AP classes. He served his community through projects with the Boy Scouts and with the Bates Elementary School library. Jaxon has been recognized as being goal oriented, which will serve him well as he enters the academy.

Alma Helaman Redd comes from a military family. His father and all of his brothers have served in the military, including an Air Force Academy graduate and a graduate of West Point. Alma is following their examples and attending the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. He graduated from the American Heritage School and is currently attending Utah Valley University after service as missionary for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. He is an Eagle Scout and a fan of ultimate frisbee. He attended Boys State and was a member of the yearbook staff, National Honor Society, and the honors band and honors choir.

Gabriel Rosa, a graduate of Skyline High School, has accepted an appointment to the U.S. Naval Academy. A leader in the making, Gabriel served as a captain and squadron commander in the Civil Air Patrol and as the chairman of the Utah Wing Cadet Advisory Council. He captained his ice hockey team, served as president of the Future Business Leaders of America—FBLA—and as the State party chairman at Boys State. Gabriel is a nationally qualified fencer in men's saber.

Ethan James Schofield will be entering the U.S. Air Force Academy after having served as a missionary for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Indonesia. A graduate of Lone Peak High School, Ethan stayed active in sports and served as the captain of the football team and as a member of the lacrosse and track and field teams. He earned his Eagle Scout Award with a project for the city of American Fork, where his team ran a tree inventory. He is an avid mountain biker and downhill skier.

Matthew Walker Schvaneveldt will again join the cadets of the U.S. Military Academy after having served in the Japan Sapporo Mission with the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Matthew graduated from the Northern Utah Academy for Math, Engineering & Science, NUAMES, where he was president of the National Honor Society. He earned his Eagle Scout Award, attended Boys State, and was honored with the Volunteer of the Year Award from McKay-Dee Hospital in Ogden, UT.

Trevor Dean Smiley is returning to the U.S. Air Force Academy following 2

years of missionary service for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in the Australia Brisbane Mission. Trevor played varsity baseball and football for Corner Canyon High School. He earned his Eagle Scout Award and spent time in Taiwan with the TIYEA leadership camp where he taught English to children.

David Sperry White is returning to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point after serving 2 years speaking Korean as a missionary for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in the Korea Seoul Mission. A proud graduate and former student body president of Uintah High School in Vernal, UT, David is an Eagle Scout and published author. He attended Boys State and was president of the service club, Vernal Youth in Action.

Michael Ammon Wintercorn has been attending Brigham Young University while preparing himself to attend the U.S. Naval Academy. He graduated from Jordan High School, where he ran for both the cross-country and track and field teams. Michael, an Eagle Scout, served on the Sandy Youth City Council and as president of his church youth group. He spent 2 years speaking Japanese as a missionary for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in the Fukuoka Japan Mission. A member of the National Honor Society, Michael also played trumpet for the symphonic band and for a local elderly care center.

Miles Stanley Zembruski is following in the footsteps of the many NASA astronauts he has long admired and accepted an appointment to the U.S. Naval Academy. A graduate of West High School, where he participated in the Navy JROTC and the Civil Air Patrol, Miles was a member of the Model Rocketry Club, the National Honor Society, and the cross-country team. He founded an independent philosophy/literature publication and a volunteer community service organization, all while maintaining a rigorous academic schedule of AP and IB classes.

It has been inspiring to nominate each of these exemplary young men and women. Doing so has given me an unshakeable confidence in the future of this great Nation and future of our Armed Services.

To these 20 students and to all their future classmates from around the country, do not forget: This is but the beginning of your journey.

You would not have arrived at this point were it not for your hard work and sacrifice and for the service and example your parents, family, teachers, coaches, and mentors. What matters most now is not your past accomplishments, but what you will achieve in the future.

Thank you.

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT GENERAL SAMUEL A. GREAVES

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Lt. Gen. Sam-

uel A. Greaves, Director of the Missile Defense Agency, on the advent of his retirement from the U.S. Air Force after 37 years of military service to this great country.

General Greaves' long and storied career began when he was commissioned in 1982 through the Air Force Reserve Officer Training Corps Program after he graduated from Cornell University. Throughout his service, he has held a variety of assignments in operational, acquisition, and staff units, including assignments at Headquarters Air Combat Command; the National Reconnaissance Office; and on the Air Staff. He commanded the 45th Launch Group at Patrick AFB, Florida, the Launch and Range Systems Wing, the Military Satellite Communications Systems Wing, also served as vice commander, Space and Missile Systems Center at Los Angeles AFB. He later served as the director, strategic plans, programs and analyses, Headquarters Air Force Space Command, Peterson AFB, Colorado, and then was assigned as the deputy director, Missile Defense Agency, Redstone Arsenal, Alabama. Prior to his current assignment, he was the commander, Space and Missile Systems Center, Air Force Space Command, Los Angeles Air Force Base, California.

His operational experience is exceptional and includes work on the space shuttle, Titan, Atlas and Delta space-launch systems. He currently wears the Command Space Badge, a joint Air Force and Army award for training, experience, and assignments in space warning, satellite command and control, missile operations, space surveillance, and/or space lift.

During his tour, the Agency and the Department of Defense made significant progress in addressing current and emerging ballistic missile threats by fielding, upgrading, and improving missile defenses to provide U.S. military commanders a highly effective ballistic missile defense capability to defend the United States and its deployed troops, U.S. allies, and friends around the world. He also laid the groundwork for the Agency's pursuit of technologies and systems to track and defeat hypersonic glide vehicle threats. General Greaves implemented a clear strategy focusing on maintaining the reliability of the Ballistic Missile Defense System, BMDS, to build warfighter confidence, increasing capability and capacity of fielded missile defense systems, and making measured investments to address the advanced threat.

While serving as the director, Missile Defense Agency, General Greaves demonstrated superior leadership, extraordinary dedication, and exceptional professionalism as the key interface between MDA and the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Joint Staff, Combatant Commands, Services and Military Departments, the Department of State, and international partners. He also

worked very closely with the administration and Congress to support significant improvements to the Nation's missile defense programs and plans in 2017, known as the missile defeat and defense enhancements, that resulted in Congress increasing the Missile Defense Agency's budget request for fiscal year 2018 from \$7.8 billion to over \$11.5 billion, which represents both the largest single year increase and total budget in MDA's history.

General Greaves placed a high priority on increasing the ground-based midcourse defense's, GMD, fleet reliability and confidence by upgrading fielded GBIs, implementing improvements in new production GBIs, and incorporating reliability, producibility and sustainability improvements in future GBI designs. General Greaves oversaw GMD ground system modernization, to include delivery of Ground System 7A, which removed obsolete equipment from the kill chain, eliminated cyber defense vulnerabilities, and improved redundancy for the warfighter. He also pressed forward with key reliability improvements, including the development of the redesigned kill vehicle, RKV, and upgrading of the GMD Communications Network, and launch support equipment.

General Greaves also successfully completed the expansion of the Nation's deployed GBI fleet to 44 interceptors in 2017, known as 44 by 17, which resulted in a nearly 50 percent increase in the number of deployed interceptors available for use by the warfighter.

Moreover, in response to the growing North Korean ICBM threat, in December 2017, General Greaves began executing Department and congressional guidance in the missile defeat and defense enhancements plan to further expand the GBI fleet to a total of 64 deployed GBIs by 2023 through the rapid and efficient construction of a new, fourth missile field at Fort Greely, AK, which will add 20 additional operational silos to the GMD system.

If this were not enough, he oversaw multiple successful flight tests. This includes flight test ground-based midcourse test 11, FTG-11, a GBI salvo test against a complex, threat representative ICBM-class target. This intercept flight test was so successful that the director for the Department Operational Test and Evaluation, DOT&E, Agency directed DOT&E staff to refer to FTG-11 as the first operational flight test of the ground-based midcourse defense system. FTM-45, also conducted under his direction, demonstrated an Aegis BMD organic engagement using a SM-3 Blk IIA against a MRBM, a key milestone for the SM-3 Block IIA return to flight. In addition, he directed the flight test integrated 3, FTI-03, an operational live fire test demonstrating the engage-on-remote capability of the Aegis Weapon System to track and intercept an IRBM target with an Aegis Ashore-launched SM-3 Block IIA interceptor.

This test demonstrated the effectiveness of the European phased adaptive approach phase 3 architecture and supports a critical acquisition milestone for the SM-3 Block IIA missile program.

General Greaves also laid the foundation for the Long Range Discrimination Radar, Homeland Defense Radar-Hawaii, Pacific Radar, and other discrimination improvements to improve homeland defense against emerging threats. He further advanced the development of two-stage booster capability to provide additional homeland defense battle-space capability by enabling shorter engagement times without the expense of a separate development program. He also continued improvements in the command and control, battle management and communication infrastructure, which provides persistent acquisition, tracking, cueing, discrimination, and fire-control quality data to Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD), GMD, Terminal High Altitude Area Defense, THAAD, Patriot, and coalition partners to support homeland and regional missile defense.

General Greaves was further responsible for major BMDS capability enhancements and asset deployments around the globe. He guided program plans to strengthen regional defenses by continuing deliveries of Standard Missile-3, SM-3, Block IBS, for use on Aegis BMD ships and at Aegis Ashore-Romania, and THAAD interceptors. After fielding the THAAD Battery to South Korea, in late 2017, the commander of United States Forces Korea requested tighter coupling between THAAD and Patriot units in theater. General Greaves worked with Army PEO Missiles and Space on proposed solutions to address the request and improve regional ballistic missile defense. He also pushed for the development of a future THAAD system, including development of a remote launcher capability, integration of Patriot MSE interceptor and launcher into the THAAD Weapon System, and improved interoperability by enabling Patriot Launch-on-Remote (THAAD).

He also continued advancement of the Aegis BMD system in collaboration with the Navy to counter growing and more complex threats, including improvements in system and missile reliability as well as increases in Aegis BMD engagement capacity and lethality, including work on the Aegis Weapon System, Aegis Ashore-Poland, the SM-3 IIA program, and Sea Based Terminal defense. General Greaves kept the Agency on track to deliver the initial SM-3 Block IIA missiles developed in cooperation with Japan to support European phased adaptive approach, EPAA, phase 3. He oversaw the construction of the Aegis Ashore system in Poland in support of EPAA Phase 3 to improve European NATO defenses against medium- and intermediate-range ballistic missiles, which is expected to be delivered in 2020.

General Greaves has been a tireless advocate for the development and de-

ployment of a critically needed space sensor layer for hypersonic and missile defense, the need for which can be best summed by the general himself when he said: "If you can't see it, you can't shoot it." As a result of his efforts, the Congress continually funded the MDA to develop such a capability. In 2019, the general partnered with DARPA and the Air Force on the Hypersonic and Ballistic Tracking Space Sensor Program, which is now working with industry to reduce the key risks for this space sensor layer.

He also successfully completed the development and deployment of a network of sensor payloads hosted on commercial satellites, called Space-based Kill Assessment, or SKA. This program will collect data on missile intercepts, and inform the post-intercept assessment by the warfighter. This capability will provide the warfighter the option to adjust their shot doctrine to more efficiently manage interceptor inventory, thereby dramatically increasing the number of threats the system can engage for the defense of the homeland. In fact, when warfighters took part in simulations involving SKA they were so highly impressed by this new capability they requested it be made operational sooner than MDA had planned. The SKA program has been so impressive that the Department recently recognized MDA, under General Greaves leadership, for its acquisition success by presenting it with the Packard Award for Acquisition Excellence for the development of SKA.

General Greaves demonstrated his commitment to expand work with U.S. international partners, to include conducting joint analyses to support partner missile defense acquisition decisions, cooperative research and development projects, deploying BMD assets, foreign military sales, FMS, and coproduction efforts. Under General Greave's leadership, the Agency executed an historic FMS case with the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia for seven THAAD batteries and accompanying launchers, radars, and interceptors. In addition, he continued work on the co-development with Japan of the SM-3 Block IIA missile that will be deployed to the operational Aegis Ashore missile defense sites in Romania and Poland.

His exceptional leadership style influenced an organization of over 10,000 personnel across 13 time zones. These distinctive accomplishments of General Greaves are monumental. As he and his wife Patricia prepare for retirement, I want to thank them for their service to the United States of America—General Greaves and Patricia—Bravo Zulu.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO ELIZABETH
GUILLOTTE AND RICHARD
"RICKY" MAZUR

• Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I am proud to recognize Elizabeth Guillotte

of Hill, NH, and Richard “Ricky” Mazur of Franklin, NH, as the May 2019 Granite Staters of the Month for their dedication to helping their classmates whose financial and/or family circumstances render them unable to afford basic necessities like clothing and toiletries.

When the Franklin High School FIRST robotics team sat down to discuss how they could give back to their community, Elizabeth and Richard had an idea: They could revamp the make-shift thrift shop at their school. Now, students at Franklin High School who are in need of anything from clothing, to toothbrushes, to cereal, can get all these items anonymously and for free at the new and improved “Karma Korner.”

Elizabeth and Richard were inspired to act after they noticed that some of their classmates were walking the halls in the same clothing that they wore the day before and learned that some classmates were eating their only meal of the day in the school cafeteria.

With the support of their FIRST Robotics teammates, the two students moved an already existing makeshift thrift shop to a wheelchair-accessible room with better lighting and brightly colored walls. They added food to the inventory of items available for students and started a program that allows students to bring home a backpack stuffed with pantry items so that they do not go hungry over the weekend.

Ensuring anonymity and, as a result, reducing stigma was important to Elizabeth and Richard. If a student wants to check out an item, all they need to do is record what they are taking on a clipboard, so that the students working the pantry know what needs to be replenished.

Many businesses in the surrounding communities have also lent their support in the form of gift cards or donated items. By collaborating with local businesses and charities, Karma Korner recently received washers and dryers for student use, which were bought and installed at no expense to the school.

In establishing Karma Korner, Elizabeth and Richard have recognized and elevated the dignity of their friends, peers, and classmates, and they have reminded us of our shared humanity and shared promise. I join the rest of the Franklin High School community in thanking Richard and Elizabeth for their efforts to help make their school a more supportive and welcoming place and congratulate them for being honored as May 2019’s Granite Staters of the Month.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. WILLIAM MEDD

● Mr. KING. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the efforts of Dr. William Medd and his work with Western Maine Health and Stephen’s Memorial Hospital. His dedicated work with MaineHealth, the largest health sys-

tem in Maine, has improved the lives and health of many residents of western Maine.

Although Bill is originally from Long Island, he has proudly called Maine home for almost five decades. He studied and specialized in Internal Medicine at Wesleyan University and then at the University of Rochester School of Medicine. Following his medical residencies and 2 years of service in the Air Force, Bill and his family relocated to western Maine in the early 1970’s.

Throughout his career, Bill has dedicated himself to improving the quality of healthcare in Maine, specifically in the rural area he has worked and lived. His efforts to achieve this goal have taken many forms, from serving as a trustee at Western Maine Health Care Corporation and MaineHealth to his 45 years as an internist in the Oxford Hills region. Perhaps one of the most symbolic aspects of Bill’s hard work is the growth of the local hospital in Norway, ME. At first a small facility when Bill arrived, it is now a fully equipped, modern hospital known as Stephen’s Memorial and provides quality healthcare to the rural region.

In early 2016, an expansion of Western Maine Health, was named the William L. Medd, MD, Health Center. This new facility integrated new models for delivering primary care and relocated other Western Maine Health units. For the last 3 years, Bill has had the unique opportunity to work out of the facility that bears his name.

On March 30 of this year, Bill was presented the Legacy Award at the Oxford Hills Chamber of Commerce annual dinner. Not only does this award embody Bill’s commitment to healthcare in Maine, but speaks to other contributions he has made to his community, from fundraising for local scholarships to supporting youth programs in the region. His work in these fields outside the medical profession demonstrate Bill’s commitment to more broadly improve his community.

I would like to thank Dr. Medd for his decade’s long work in the State of Maine. Thanks to his determination and drive to make a difference, the future of healthcare in western Maine is bright. Dr. Medd’s passion for his patients, community, and State sets an example for the medical professionals who will follow him.

Congratulations, Dr. Medd, on a successful career and happy retirement. I look forward to seeing your continued contributions to your community.●

200TH ANNIVERSARY OF PITTSFIELD, MAINE

● Mr. KING. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the town of Pittsfield, ME, which is celebrating its 200th anniversary this year. Throughout its long history, Pittsfield has continually displayed a rich heritage of hard work, entrepreneurship, innovation, community, and family spirit. Situated along the Sebasticook River in Somerset

County, Pittsfield is home to roughly 4,200 residents who help make it a thriving Maine town.

Incorporated as Warsaw in 1819, the town became Pittsfield in 1824, named after one its prominent citizens, William Pitts. Early on, most of the town’s occupants were farmers, growing so much corn and wheat that they used the grains to pay their taxes. Like many Maine towns, Pittsfield began to develop a strong mill industry that flourished along the Sebasticook River. This assortment of textile, saw, and grist mills created hundreds of new jobs and Pittsfield saw its population nearly double in just 40 years. Closures and relocation of many of the town’s mills lead to some decline, but the citizens of Pittsfield helped reinvent the town, and today, Pittsfield is as vibrant as ever.

Maine Central Institute, an independent high school, opened in 1866 and continues to serve many of the town’s residents and foreign students from such countries as South Korea, Spain, Guatemala, and many more. The school’s Manson Essay contest continues to bring members of the community together every year to hear presentations by students on their university level research papers. Along with its high-level academics, MCI’s impressive athletic program has produced a number of professional athletes, many of whom have gone on to play professional basketball.

A hallmark of Pittsfield’s economy, Cianbro was founded by Carl Cianchette in 1946. Cianchette and his brothers would go on to grow this company into the largest construction company in Maine, providing thousands of jobs throughout the State. Now nationally recognized and 100 percent employee owned, with locations stretching into the mid-Atlantic region, Cianbro is still headquartered in Pittsfield.

It is an honor and a privilege to congratulate Pittsfield on this historic occasion. For 200 years the town and its residents have repeatedly demonstrated the hard work and community spirit found throughout Maine. I hope the residents of Pittsfield take the opportunity during this yearlong celebration to reflect on their rich history and strive to make the next 200 years as prosperous as the last. Happy 200th birthday, Pittsfield, and congratulations to all who have made this a vibrant Maine community.●

TRIBUTE TO T. MICHAEL PUTNAM

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the Honorable T. Michael Putnam, who is formally stepping down from his 32-year term as a U.S. magistrate judge, effective on June 7, 2019. Judge Putnam served the Northern District of Alabama as a magistrate and chief magistrate judge during his many years of service to the court. He is the longest serving magistrate judge in the history of the

Northern District of Alabama, and I certainly commend him for this accomplishment. At the time of his appointment, Judge Putnam was the youngest magistrate judge in the country at age 32.

Instrumental in the expansion of the role of magistrate judges, Judge Putnam worked to highlight their value in the judicial process. He acted as the chair and vice chair of the Northern District's Criminal Justice Act Administrative Committee, playing a significant role in ensuring the highest quality of representation of indigent criminal defendants in the Northern District under the Criminal Justice Act.

Judge Putnam is widely known for his volunteer work at the Cumberland School of Law in Birmingham, AL. He has taught a pretrial practice and procedure class since 2006 and directed many trial advocacy and moot court programs. The Cumberland School of Law named Judge Putnam the 2019 recipient of the Friend of the Law School Award in recognition of his time and dedication to the betterment of students at Cumberland. The Young Lawyers Section of the Birmingham Bar Association also selected him for the Judge Drayton Nobles James Award in 2016, where they honored his spirit of volunteerism.

As an advocate for the Northern District, Judge Putnam played an active role in using technology to improve efficiency. He has been a judicial resource for the Office of the Clerk while implementing procedural changes to the electronic filing system. Judge Putnam led the Court in establishing the eVoucher system, making it easier for attorneys and courts to process vouchers for appointed counsel in criminal cases.

Judge Putnam received his bachelor of arts from the University of Alabama and his juris doctorate from the University of Alabama School of Law. He graduated in the top 5 percent of his class and was a Hugo L. Black Scholar.

Judge Putnam's contributions to Alabama's judicial system are truly remarkable and will have an impact for generations to come. I am proud to take this time to recognize and thank him for his service to the people of our great State and his unwavering commitment to the rule of law. I join Judge Putnam's friends, family, and colleagues in wishing him the best of luck as he transitions into a new chapter of his life.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:57 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1200. An act to increase, effective as of December 1, 2019, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of cer-

tain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1812. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to furnish Vet Center readjustment counseling and related mental health services to certain individuals.

H.R. 1947. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to exempt transfers of funds from Federal agencies to the Department of Veterans Affairs for nonprofit corporations established under subchapter IV of chapter 73 of such title from certain provisions of the Economy Act, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2045. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish in the Department the Veterans Economic Opportunity and Transition Administration, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2326. An act to amend the Social Security Act, to amend the Dignified Burial and Other Veterans' Benefits Improvement Act of 2012, and to direct the Secretaries of Veterans Affairs, Defense, Labor, and Homeland Security, and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, to take certain actions to improve transition assistance to members of the Armed Forces who separate, retire, or are discharged from the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2333. An act to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an assessment of the responsibilities, workload, and vacancy rates of Department of Veterans Affairs suicide prevention coordinators, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2340. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide to Congress notice of any suicide or attempted suicide of a veteran in a Department of Veterans Affairs facility, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2359. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress a report on the Department of Veterans Affairs advancing of whole health transformation.

H.R. 2372. An act to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an assessment of all memoranda of understanding and memoranda of agreement between Under Secretary of Health and non-Department of Veterans Affairs entities relating to suicide prevention and mental health services.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-1338. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fluensulfone; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL 9992-69-OCSP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1339. A communication from the Program and Management Analyst, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Miscellaneous Conservation Provisions" (RIN0578-AA69) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 17, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1340. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Department of Energy Activities Relating to the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, Fiscal Year 2018"; to the Committees on Energy and Natural Resources; Appropriations; and Armed Services.

EC-1341. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Hydroelectric Licensing Regulations Under the America's Water Infrastructure Act of 2018" ((RIN1902-AF59) (Docket No. RM19-6-000)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2019; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1342. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Georgia: Permit Exemption for Fire Fighting" (FRL No. 9993-89-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1343. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Georgia; Miscellaneous Revisions" (FRL No. 9994-14-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1344. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Illinois; Redesignation of the Illinois Portion of the St. Louis, MO-IL Area to attainment of the 1997 Annual Standard for Fine Particulate Matter" (FRL No. 9994-11-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1345. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Indiana; Volatile Organic Liquid Storage Tank Rules" (FRL No. 9994-10-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1346. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Kentucky: Jefferson County Process Operations" (FRL No. 9993-90-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1347. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Massachusetts; Nonattainment New Source Review Program Revisions; Infrastructure Provisions for National Ambient Air Quality Standards; Nonattainment New Source Review Requirements for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard" (FRL No. 9993-84-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1348. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; NC; Permitting Revisions" (FRL No. 9993-97-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1349. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Revisions to

Particulate Matter Rules" (FRL No. 9994-12-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1350. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Montana; Missoula PM10 Nonattainment Area Limited Maintenance Plan and Redesignation Request" (FRL No. 9993-66-Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1351. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New York; Cross-State Air Pollution Rule; NOx Ozone Season Group 2, NOx Annual, and SO2 Group 1 Trading Programs" (FRL No. 9993-69-Region 2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1352. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2019-0032 - 2019-0036); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1353. A communication from the Director, White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Education, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 20, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1354. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting proposed legislation relative to the responsibilities of the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) within the General Services Administration (GSA); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1355. A communication from the General Counsel, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Office of Management and Budget, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1356. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report on applications made by the Government for authority to conduct electronic surveillance for foreign intelligence during calendar year 2018 relative to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978; to the Committees on the Judiciary; Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; and Select Committee on Intelligence.

EC-1357. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary/Director, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1358. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Department of

Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Adjusting Program Fees for the Student and Exchange Visitor Program" (RIN1653-AA74) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1359. A communication from the Regulation Policy Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Core Values, Characteristics, and Customer Experience Principles of the Department" (RIN2900-AQ60) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2019; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-1360. A communication from the Assistant Director, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Streamlining Annual Rate Publication for VA Educational Benefits" (RIN2900-AP99) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2019; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-63. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Georgia urging the United States Congress to pass funding legislation that will secure the southern border of the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 114

Whereas, it is imperative that the United States Congress pass the laws needed to provide the necessary funding for securing the southern border of this great nation; and

Whereas, the growing crisis of illegal immigration threatens the security of United States citizens; and

Whereas, in 2017 and 2018 alone, approximately 235,000 illegal immigrants were arrested; more than half of those arrests were for violent crimes against Americans, 4,000 of whom were murdered; and

Whereas, each week, 300 Americans die of using heroin that comes to this country through drug smuggling at our southern border; and

Whereas, a high steel barrier along 234 miles of this nation's southern border would effectively prevent illegal immigrants and contraband from reaching the United States; and

Whereas, the Trump administration has requested \$5.7 billion for the construction of a steel barrier along the southern border, \$4.2 billion for detention center materials and personnel, \$563 million for additional immigration judges and support staff to reduce the backlog of immigration cases, \$211 million for additional border patrol agents, \$571 million for additional ICE personnel, and \$675 million to prevent illegal drugs and weapons from crossing our borders; and

Whereas, Congress has not yet responded to the Trump administration's request to secure the nation's southern border; and

Whereas, if Congress imposed a tariff on all moneys wired by individuals with no proof of citizenship or who are not in the country legally, it would provide the funding for the necessary infrastructure to secure the southern border: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That the members of this body urge Congress to pass funding legislation that will make the security of the southern border of the United States a reality; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to make appropriate copies of this resolution available for distribution to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the congressional delegation from this state.

POM-64. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Georgia urging the United States Congress to award the Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II Merrill's Marauders; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 466

Whereas, in August, 1943, President Franklin D. Roosevelt and British Prime Minister Winston Churchill proposed creation of a top-secret, "expendable" American ground unit to engage in a "long-range penetration mission" behind enemy lines in Japanese occupied Burma to cut off communications and supply lines and capture northern Burma's only strategic, all-weather Myitkyina airfield; and

Whereas, President Roosevelt issued a 1943 call for volunteers for "a dangerous and hazardous mission," answered by approximately 3,000 American Infantrymen from stateside, the Caribbean, and the South Pacific, representing 15 ethnic groups from every state and including a Bataan Death March survivor, Nisei interpreters, a Native American code talker, and Pearl Harbor survivors; and

Whereas, the top-secret unit, expecting no survivors, was officially designated in January, 1944, as the 5307th Composite Unit Provisional (CUP), code-named "Galahad," which later became known as "Merrill's Marauders," after their leader, Brigadier General Frank D. Merrill; and

Whereas, in February, 1944, the Marauders began their approximately 1,000 mile march through dense Burmese jungle and up the Himalayan Mountains with no artillery support, carrying only what they could pack on their backs or mules, and would become the first Americans to engage the Japanese on the ground in Asia and the first Americans to fight there since the 1900 Boxer Rebellion; and

Whereas, the Marauders fought valiantly during their five-month march to the Myitkyina airfield, defeating the much larger and better equipped elite Japanese 18th Division in five major and 30 minor engagements, and no other WWII U.S. combat force, except the First Marine Division which took and held Guadalcanal for four months, experienced as much uninterrupted jungle fighting; and

Whereas, the Marauders endured starvation, disease, monsoons, and isolation, which were exacerbated by inadequate aerial resupply drops, and malaria, typhus, dysentery, and other jungle maladies inflicted more casualties on the Marauders than the Japanese; and

Whereas, only several hundred Marauders remained fit enough, after climbing the Himalaya's disease infested, 6,100 foot Naura Hkyat Pass, to seize their objective of the Myitkyina airfield, which enabled supplies to be flown into Burma to connect the Ledo and Burma roads so a crucial Allied pathway could be forged into China; and

Whereas, on August 10, 1944, when the 5307th CUP was deactivated, without even a formation, only about 100 skeletal-looking Merrill's Marauders were left in Burma with the remainder evacuated due to jungle diseases, exhaustion, and malnutrition; and

Whereas, for their bravery, sacrifice, and success, Merrill's Marauders were awarded numerous medals and decorations, including the Presidential Unit Citation, and each member of the 5307th CUP has the "rare distinction" of being awarded a Bronze Star; and

Whereas, although Merrill's Marauders were a short-lived commando unit, the legacy of their bravery is honored by the Army's 75th Ranger Regiment, which traces its lineage to the 5307th CUP, wears the Merrill's Marauders patch as their crest, and named their military intelligence building "Melillo Hall" in honor of Georgia's last original Merrill's Marauder, Vincent Melillo; and

Whereas, Georgia is honored to commemorate 2019 as the 75th anniversary of the Merrill's Marauders mission in the China Burma India Theater, known today as the Forgotten Theater of WWII, and salutes the state's large Ranger presence: the 75th Ranger Regiment, 3rd Ranger Battalion, and Airborne Ranger Training Brigade, all at Ft. Benning; Camp Merrill in Dahlonga; and 1st Ranger Battalion, Hunter Army Airfield in Savannah; and

Whereas, U.S. Representative Peter T. King (R-NY) introduced H.R. 906 with Congressman Sanford Bishop (D-GA) as a major cosponsor, and U.S. Senator Johnny Isakson (R-GA) introduced S. 743 in the 116th Congress, the "Merrill's Marauders Congressional Gold Medal Act," and this third attempt might be the last since only 13 out of the original 3,000 Merrill's Marauders are still living:

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That the members of this body commend the 75th anniversary of the WWII Merrill's Marauders mission and urge the Congress of the United States to act favorably on legislation to award the Congressional Gold Medal, the highest honor Congress can bestow, to Merrill's Marauders; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to make appropriate copies of this resolution available for distribution to President Donald J. Trump, Vice President Michael Pence, Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi, Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, and each senator and representative from Georgia in the Congress of the United States.

POM-65. A joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee memorializing its support for the enactment of legislation that requires all board committee meetings of the Tennessee Valley Authority Board of Directors to be open to the public; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 192

Whereas, established in 1933, the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) is a corporate agency of the United States that provides electricity for business customers and local power companies, serving ten million people in parts of seven southeastern states; and

Whereas, TVA also provides flood control, navigation, and land management for the Tennessee River system and assists local power companies and state and local governments with economic development and job creation; and

Whereas, Tennessee Congressman Tim Burchett has introduced the Tennessee Valley Authority Transparency Act of 2019, legislation to require that committee meetings and subcommittee meetings of the Tennessee Valley Authority Board of Directors be transparent and open to the public; and

Whereas, the bill would amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 Section 2(g)(2) to include a provision on transparency that would require meetings of the TV A Board to be held in public, properly noticed, and with minutes and summaries of each meeting made available; and

Whereas, it is vitally important to the citizens of Tennessee that TVA, as an entity cre-

ated and protected by Congress, should conduct their business in the open and be as transparent as possible; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the One Hundred Eleventh General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, the House of Representatives concurring, That we strongly support the passage of the Tennessee Valley Authority Transparency Act of 2019; and be it further

Resolved, That an appropriate copy of this resolution be prepared and transmitted to the Speaker and the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the President and the Secretary of the United States Senate, and each member of Tennessee's delegation to the United States Congress.

POM-66. A joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee memorializing its support for the enactment of legislation that requires all board committee meetings of the Tennessee Valley Authority Board of Directors to be open to the public; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 192

Whereas, established in 1933, the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) is a corporate agency of the United States that provides electricity for business customers and local power companies, serving ten million people in parts of seven southeastern states; and

Whereas, TVA also provides flood control, navigation, and land management for the Tennessee River system and assists local power companies and state and local governments with economic development and job creation; and

Whereas, Tennessee Congressman Tim Burchett has introduced the Tennessee Valley Authority Transparency Act of 2019, legislation to require that committee meetings and subcommittee meetings of the Tennessee Valley Authority Board of Directors be transparent and open to the public; and

Whereas, the bill would amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 Section 2(g)(2) to include a provision on transparency that would require meetings of the TVA Board to be held in public, properly noticed, and with minutes and summaries of each meeting made available; and

Whereas, it is vitally important to the citizens of Tennessee that TVA, as an entity created and protected by Congress, should conduct their business in the open and be as transparent as possible; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the One Hundred Eleventh General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, the House of Representatives concurring, that we strongly support the passage of the Tennessee Valley Authority Transparency Act of 2019; and be it further

Resolved, That an appropriate copy of this resolution be prepared and transmitted to the Speaker and the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the President and the Secretary of the United States Senate, and each member of Tennessee's delegation to the United States Congress.

POM-67. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Georgia urging the United States Congress to eliminate the five-month waiting period for disability insurance benefits for individuals living with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS); to the Committee on Finance.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 276

Whereas, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS) is commonly known as Lou Gehrig's disease; and

Whereas, ALS is a progressive and fatal neuromuscular disease; and

Whereas, the average time to diagnosis is more than 12 months; and

Whereas, the majority of ALS patients die within two to five years of receiving a diagnosis; and

Whereas, approximately 6,000 people in the United States are diagnosed with ALS each year; and

Whereas, the incidence of ALS is two per 100,000 people, and it is estimated that more than 20,000 Americans may be living with ALS at any given time; and

Whereas, ALS occurs through the world with no racial, ethnic, or socioeconomic boundaries and can affect anyone; and

Whereas, military veterans are approximately twice as likely to develop ALS; and

Whereas, the onset of ALS often involves muscle weakness or stiffness as early symptoms. Progression of weakness, wasting, and paralysis of the muscles of the limbs and trunk, as well as those that control vital functions such as speech, swallowing, and later breathing, generally follows; and

Whereas, there can be significant costs for medical care, equipment, and home health caregiving later in the disease; and

Whereas, under current law, individuals must wait five months after becoming disabled before their Social Security Disability Insurance benefit payments can begin; and

Whereas, last year, Congress considered legislation that would eliminate the five-month waiting period for disability insurance benefits for individuals with ALS, but it unfortunately did not become law; and

Whereas, this body recognizes that persons living with ALS cannot wait for benefits. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate that this body urges Congress to eliminate the five-month waiting period for disability insurance benefits for individuals living with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS). Be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to make appropriate copies of this resolution available for distribution to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Congressional delegation from this state.

POM-68. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana urging the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to pass the Disability Integration Act of 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 8

Whereas, the Disability Integration Act of 2019 has been introduced as S. 117 and H.R. 555 in the One Hundred Sixteenth United States Congress; and

Whereas, in enacting the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (herein referred to as the "ADA"), Congress recognized that "historically, society has tended to isolate and segregate individuals with disabilities, and, despite some improvements, such forms of discrimination against individuals with disabilities continue to be a serious and pervasive social problem" and intended that the ADA assure "full participation" and "independent living" for individuals with disabilities by addressing "discrimination against individuals with disabilities [that] persists in critical areas", including institutionalization; and

Whereas, while Congress expected that the ADA's integration mandate would be interpreted in a manner that ensures that individuals who are eligible for institutional placement are able to exercise a right to community-based long-term services and supports, that expectation has not been fulfilled; and

Whereas, the holdings of the Supreme Court in *Olmstead v. LC*, 527 U.S. 581 (1999), and companion cases, have clearly articulated that individuals with disabilities, have a civil right under the ADA to participate in

society as equal citizens; however, many states still do not provide sufficient community-based long-term services and supports to individuals with disabilities to end segregation in institutions; and

Whereas, the right to live in the community is necessary for the exercise of the civil rights that the ADA was intended to secure for all individuals with disabilities and the lack of adequate community-based services and supports has imperiled the civil rights of all individuals with disabilities, and has undermined the very promise of the ADA; therefore, it is necessary to recognize in statute a robust and fully articulated right to community living; and

Whereas, states, with a few exceptions, continue to approach decisions regarding long-term services and supports from social welfare and budgetary perspectives, but for the promise of the ADA to be fully realized, states must approach these decisions from a civil rights perspective; and

Whereas, states have not consistently planned to ensure sufficient services and supports for individuals with disabilities, including those with the most significant disabilities, to enable individuals with disabilities to live in the most integrated setting and, as a result, many individuals with disabilities who reside in institutions are prevented from residing in the community and individuals with disabilities who are not in institutions find themselves at risk of institutional placement; and

Whereas, the continuing existence of unfair and unnecessary institutionalization denies individuals with disabilities the opportunity to live and participate on an equal basis in the community and costs the United States billions of dollars in unnecessary spending related to perpetuating dependency and unnecessary confinement: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana memorializes the Congress of the United States to take such actions as are necessary to pass the Disability Integration Act of 2019; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution shall be transmitted to the secretary of the United States Senate and the clerk of the United States House of Representatives and to each member of the Louisiana delegation to the United States Congress.

POM-69. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Louisiana commending finalists of the annual international environmental poetry and art contest sponsored by the River of Words; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 89

Whereas, River of Words is a non-profit arts and environmental education program, founded in 1995 by then United States Poet Laureate, Robert Hass and writer Pamela Michael, which annually, in affiliation with the Library of Congress Center for the Book, conducts an international poetry and art contest; and

Whereas, the River of Words contest is considered by educators as one of the most prestigious contests in the country, and

Whereas, poems written by the five outstanding students from the Greater Baton Rouge area, the only Louisiana finalists, were selected from tens of thousands of entries received from the United States and many other countries; and

Whereas, the natural world as seen through the eyes of its children is heartening, humbling, fresh, and life-affirming; and

Whereas, the watershed art and poetry submitted to River of Words is exhibited around the globe and is seen by millions of people each year; and

Whereas, every poem contributes to an informed appreciation of the natural world and the interconnectedness of all beings; and

Whereas, the five student finalists in this prestigious contest have demonstrated with their effort and their words an extraordinary level of skill and talent as writers and a finely discerning eye for the wonder of the natural world; and

Whereas, Connie McDonald, teacher at Louisiana State University Laboratory School and Wes Dannreuther, teacher at Broadmoor Middle Magnet School have nurtured a new generation and in turn have produced imaginative, informed, and heartfelt earth stewards, prepared to address the significant environmental and social challenges of the Twenty-First Century.

Therefore, Be it Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana hereby commends Haley Binder for her winning poem entitled "Starting Sundays," Billy Creed for his winning poem entitled "Berwick," Rafael Espinoza for her winning poem entitled "Nature Sleeps," Daniel Koepp for his winning poem entitled "Beyond My Window," and Christina Welsch for her winning poem entitled "Wet Nurse"; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana hereby commends Connie McDonald and Wes Dannreuther for not only sharing their talents with these students, but for teaching them respect for and an understanding of the natural world, as well; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to Haley Binder, Billy Creed, Rafael Espinoza, Daniel Koepp, Christina Welsch, Connie McDonald, and Wes Dannreuther.

POM-70. A resolution adopted by the House of Delegates of the State of West Virginia memorializing its support of ongoing and continued development of West Virginia's energy resources, pipeline, and energy infrastructure; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 6

Whereas, West Virginia's natural gas and energy reserves and production have increased significantly in recent years due to the exploration occurring in the Utica and Marcellus Shale formations; and

Whereas, West Virginia is now the ninth-largest natural gas producing state in the nation, providing five percent of our country's total energy; and

Whereas, The natural gas and oil industry supported over 70,000 jobs both directly and indirectly and added \$8 billion to the West Virginian economy; and

Whereas, Pipelines and transmission lines serve a critical role in delivering natural gas, petroleum, and electricity in order to meet our growing energy needs; and

Whereas, Denying the expansion and construction of existing and new pipeline projects would stop the significant revitalization of communities and manufacturing industries in West Virginia; and

Whereas, The U.S. Department of Energy has identified the benefits that West Virginia can accrue with the establishment of an ethane storage and distribution hub to promote diversity of supply and geography, alleviating the strategic risk our country faces as a result of a lack of redundancy and flexibility; and

Whereas, West Virginia is business friendly and welcomes investments in the state and local economy; and

Whereas, West Virginia's neighbors, including Ohio and Pennsylvania, have benefitted from using natural gas to attract industry; and

Whereas, The natural gas intensive industry sector in Ohio has an output of \$160 bil-

lion and Pennsylvania has an output of \$156 billion in comparison to West Virginia's output of \$18 billion; and

Whereas, Ohio and Pennsylvania have over 300,000 jobs in natural gas intensive industry sector while West Virginia has over 30,000 jobs in the natural gas intensive industry sector; therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Delegates:

That we, the members of the House of Delegates of the 84th Legislature of the State of West Virginia, support the ongoing and continued development of West Virginia's energy resources, pipeline, and energy infrastructure in the State of West Virginia; and, be it further

Resolved, That we, the members of the House of Delegates of the 84th Legislature of the State of West Virginia, support ongoing economic development efforts to attract end-users of electricity and natural gas to expand our state's economy and create family sustaining jobs; and, be it further

Resolved, That the Clerk transmit duly authenticated copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President Pro Tempore and Secretary of the United States Senate, the members of the West Virginia Congressional delegation, and the news media of West Virginia.

POM-71. A resolution adopted by the House of Delegates of the State of West Virginia memorializing its support of the Atlantic Coast Pipeline; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 11

Whereas, The Atlantic Coast Pipeline and others are critical to the economic and energy future of the State of West Virginia, providing our state's natural gas production with unprecedented access to new markets; and

Whereas, Studies indicate construction and operation of the Atlantic Coast Pipeline alone will generate massive economic benefits for West Virginia, including almost \$478 million in additional economic activity during the construction period and more than \$15 million in additional economic activity each year after the facility begins operating; and

Whereas, The Atlantic Coast Pipeline and others will create thousands of new job opportunities for the working men and women of West Virginia and significant new tax revenues for many West Virginia counties; and

Whereas, The Atlantic Coast Pipeline and others will help promote our nation's energy independence, helping make the burgeoning natural gas production in West Virginia and adjacent states more available to millions of consumers and reducing the need for energy imports; and

Whereas, The Atlantic Coast Pipeline's environmental impact has been repeatedly and thoroughly analyzed by state and federal agencies, including the West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and the U.S. Forest Service, among others, with all of the agencies finding that the project can be built and operated in a manner that protects the natural resources of West Virginia and the other states in its path; and

Whereas, Despite the enormous energy and economic benefits, as well as the positive findings from a broad range of environmental regulatory agencies, some groups have launched an all-out assault on the Atlantic Coast Pipeline project, with the ultimate aim of forcing its cancellation; and

Whereas, These attacks are not based on the facts regarding the Atlantic Coast Pipeline but are part of what the U.S. Chamber of Commerce describes as a nationwide "keep it in the ground" strategy by some groups to

end all uses of fossil fuels in power generation; and

Whereas, These unwarranted attacks have resulted in regulatory and legal proceedings that have repeatedly delayed both the Atlantic Coast Pipeline and the related Supply Header Project; and

Whereas, In response to court orders stemming from these attacks, the Atlantic Coast Pipeline and Supply Header Project have been forced to lay off or delay hiring thousands of skilled construction workers in West Virginia and also in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Virginia and North Carolina, posing significant hardships for working families and depriving them of paychecks and steady work; and

Whereas, The U.S. Chamber of Commerce report estimates that these delays, through August 2018, have already resulted in the loss of \$2.3 billion in the U.S. Gross Domestic Product as well as \$500 million in lost tax revenue for U.S. states and localities; and

Whereas, The Chamber's study also found that the delays have already deprived U.S. consumers of \$377 million in energy cost savings; and

Whereas, The General President of the Laborers' International Union of North America (LIUNA) recently said obstructions to the Atlantic Coast Pipeline and other vital energy infrastructure "from activist groups is costing our members jobs and the entire country opportunities"; and

Whereas, The LIUNA General President also emphasized that the economic damage caused by this opposition to new energy projects is "being shouldered by the hard working men and women who build our nation's energy infrastructure"; and

Whereas, These assaults and delaying tactics are also a direct threat to West Virginia's energy production industry, which directly employs more than 22,000 men and women and pays more than \$6 billion in wages annually; and

Whereas, Although the current employment and payroll figures are impressive, further growth will be severely hampered unless new infrastructure such as the Atlantic Coast Pipeline and other pipelines are built to transport West Virginia's energy production to market; and

Whereas, In addition to this economic damage, the attacks on the Atlantic Coast Pipeline and other interstate natural gas projects have great potential to harm the environment, since other forms of electric generation powered by fossil fuels, such as natural gas, are needed to back up the expansion of the intermittent generation from renewable resources such as solar and wind energy; therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Delegates: That we, the members of the House of Delegates of the 84th Legislature of the State of West Virginia, categorically condemn these counterproductive and economically damaging assaults on the Atlantic Coast Pipeline and other urgently needed energy infrastructure projects; and, be it further

Resolved, That we note that these attacks are denying steady employment and income to thousands of West Virginia workers and their families who would otherwise be employed in the construction and operation of the Atlantic Coast Pipeline and the related Supply Header Project; and, be it further

Resolved, That we find that the attacks are also damaging West Virginia's energy production industry, the source of more than \$6 billion annually in wages to our state's working men and women; and, be it further

Resolved, That we find that the assaults on these projects have great potential to damage the environment by hindering the deployment of electric generation powered by solar power, wind and other renewable re-

sources, all of which must be backed up with fossil fuel powered generation, such as natural gas; and, be it further

Resolved, That we strongly urge the groups spearheading these assaults to stop their attacks and delaying actions and in the process help pave the way for a cleaner and stronger energy future for West Virginia and for the entire nation; and, be it further

Resolved, That the Clerk transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President Pro Tempore and Secretary of the United States Senate, the members of the West Virginia Congressional delegation, and the news media of West Virginia.

POM-72. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of North Dakota urging the United States Congress to pass Savanna's Act; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 3041

Whereas, homicide is the third leading cause of death among American Indian and Alaska Native women between 10 and 24 years of age and the fifth leading cause of death for American Indian and Alaska Native women between 25 and 34 years of age; and

Whereas, in some tribal communities, American Indian women are murdered at more than 10 times the national average; and

Whereas, Native American and Alaska Native women are at least two times more likely to experience rape or sexual assault and two and one-half times more likely to experience violent crimes compared to all other races, and those factors often are tied to cases involving a disappearance or murder; and

Whereas, the National Crime Information Center reported 5,712 cases of missing American Indian and Alaska Native women and girls in 2016, yet the United States Department of Justice's federal missing persons database only logged 116 cases; and

Whereas, in 2016, North Dakota had 125 cases of Native American women and girls reported missing to the National Crime Information Center, with many cases likely going unreported; and

Whereas, Savanna LaFontaine-Greywind, for whom the federal legislation is named, was a member of the Spirit Lake Tribe and vanished when she was eight months pregnant; and

Whereas, Savanna's Act will improve tribal access to federal crime information databases on missing persons and cooperation among tribal, federal, state, and local law enforcement, and will mandate the Attorney General consult with tribes and submit a report to Congress on how to resolve the barriers tribes face; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of North Dakota, the Senate concurring therein, That the Sixty-sixth Legislative Assembly urges the Congress of the United States to pass Savanna's Act; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State forward copies of this resolution to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate, and each member of the North Dakota Congressional Delegation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GRAHAM, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1321. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit interference with voting systems under the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act.

S. 1328. A bill to designate foreign persons who improperly interfere in United States elections as inadmissible aliens, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BURR, from the Select Committee on Intelligence, without amendment:

S. 1589. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2018, 2019, and 2020 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. RISCH for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Jeffrey L. Eberhardt, of Wisconsin, a Career Member of the Senior Executive Service, to be Special Representative of the President for Nuclear Nonproliferation, with the rank of Ambassador.

Nominee: Jeffrey L. Eberhardt.

Post: Special Representative for Nuclear Nonproliferation.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: none.

2. Spouse: N/A.

3. Children and Spouses: Jeffrey T. and Michelle Eberhardt: none; Joshua and Stefanie Eberhardt: none; Grant McElwaine (ss): none; Heather Leigeberger (wife of Grant): none; Andrew McElwaine (ss): deceased.

4. Parents: Richard Eberhardt: \$50, 10/2018, Tammy Baldwin: \$35, 8/2018, Tammy Baldwin: \$35, 7/2018, Tammy Baldwin: \$35, 4/2018, Tammy Baldwin: \$25, 10/2016, Russ for Wisconsin: \$25, 10/2016, Russ for Wisconsin. Esther Eberhardt: none.

5. Grandparents: Earnest and Aleda Eberhardt—deceased; Leroy and Marie Still—deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Richard A. Eberhardt, none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: N/A.

Kenneth A. Howery, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Sweden.

Nominee: Kenneth Alan Howery.

Post: Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Sweden.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: \$2,000, Oct 7, 2016, Tiberi for Congress (Patrick J. Tiberi).

2. Spouse: N/A.

3. Children and Spouses: N/A.

4. Parents: Charles Kenneth Howery, none; Karen Elaine Howery, none.

5. Grandparents: Fred Charles Howery—deceased for more than 5 years; Dorothy Ann Howery—deceased, none; Hubert Robert Jurek—deceased for more than 5 years; Alice Albina Jurek—deceased for more than 5 years.

6. Brothers and Spouses: N/A.
7. Sisters and Spouses: Christina Ann Howery, none; John Phillip McLellan, none.

Bridget A. Brink, of Michigan, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Slovak Republic.

Nominee: Bridget A. Brink.
Post: Slovak Republic.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: Bridget A Brink, None.
2. Spouse: Nicholas B. Higgins \$100, 10/05/16, Hillary for America.
3. Children and Spouses: Jack M. Higgins (minor), None; Cole A. Higgins (minor), None.
4. Parents: Gwendolyn D. Brink, None; John C. Brink, None.
5. Grandparents: Donald M. Brink, Deceased; Margaret Brink, Deceased; Robert J. Williams, Deceased; Cecelia Williams, Deceased.
6. Brothers and Spouses:
7. Sisters and Spouses: Joanna Brink, None.

John Jefferson Daigle, of Louisiana, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Cabo Verde.

Nominee: Daigle, John Jefferson ("Jeff").
Post: Cabo Verde.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: none.
2. Spouse: Cuenca-Daigle, Matthew Tito: none.
3. Children and Spouses: NA.
4. Parents: Daigle, Warren Roland (father)—deceased; Daigle, Carole Kaye (mother), none.
5. Grandparents: Gordon, Katherine Marie (grandmother)—deceased; Evans, John Murray Evans (grandfather)—deceased; Daigle, O'Neal James, Sr. (grandfather)—deceased; Daigle, Eva Coureges (grandmother)—deceased.
6. Brothers and Spouses: Daigle, Douglas James (brother), none; Daigle, Wanda Sue (spouse)—deceased.
7. Sisters and Spouses: Duplechin, Cheryl Marie (sister), none; Duplechin, Daniel Joseph, Sr. (spouse)—deceased; Thibodeaux, Nancy Gayle (sister), none; Thibodeaux, David Wayne (spouse), none; Tortorich, Melissa Eve (sister), none; Thibodeaux, Patricia Daigle (sister), none; Thibodeaux, Danny Paul (spouse), none; Daigle, Peggy Anne (sister), none; Daigle, Janet Elizabeth (sister)—deceased; LeJeune, Dawn Daigle (sister), none; LeJeune, Tommy Jason (spouse), none; Schexnaydre, Katherine Daigle (sister), none; Schexnaydre, Lance Paul (spouse), none; Perera, Shane Elizabeth (sister), none; Perera, Jeremy Paul (spouse), none; Hannegan, Eva Daigle (sister), none; Hannegan, Jason Paul (spouse), none.

Matthew S. Klimow, of New York, a Career Member of the Senior Executive Service, to

be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Turkmenistan.

Nominee: Matthew S. Klimow.

Post: Ambassador to Turkmenistan.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: None.
2. Spouse: Edith Gunnels: \$50, 4/15/2018, Lisa Lloyd 4 Congress; \$250, 6/16/2017, Fairfax County Republican Committee.
3. Children and Spouses: Daniel A.T. Klimow (Son), None; Mrs. Elizabeth Klimow (nee Finan), None.
4. Parents: Stephen Klimow—deceased since 2007; Dorothy Klimow—deceased since 2003.
5. Grandparents: Matthew Klimow—deceased since 1936; Elizabeth Klimow—deceased since 1945; Anthony Dyjur—deceased since 1980; Frances Dear—deceased since 1981.
6. Brothers and Spouses: No Brothers.
7. Sisters and Spouses: Susan Klimow Micks (Sister), None; John Micks (Brother in law), None.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Kenneth H. Merten and ending with Kevin M. Whitaker, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 25, 2019.

Foreign Service nomination of Lisa Anne Rigoli.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Timothy Ryan Harrison and ending with Rachel Lynne Vanderberg, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 10, 2019.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 1585. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide students with disabilities and their families with access to critical information needed to select the right college and succeed once enrolled; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 1586. A bill to abolish the Federal Insurance Office of the Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1587. A bill to impose a tax on certain trading transactions to invest in our families and communities, improve our infrastructure and our environment, strengthen our financial security, expand opportunity and reduce market volatility; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. RISCH):

S. 1588. A bill to repeal certain provisions of the Federal Switchblade Act to allow domestic manufacturers to ship and sell their products to buyers located in other States, to permit the importation of certain knife parts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BURR:

S. 1589. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2018, 2019, and 2020 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes; from the Select Committee on Intelligence; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1590. A bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to authorize rewards for thwarting wildlife trafficking linked to transnational organized crime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself,

Ms. DURBIN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. Kaine, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. COONS):

S. 1591. A bill to nullify the effect of the Executive order that makes the vast majority of unauthorized individuals priorities for removal and aims to withhold critical Federal funding to sanctuary cities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. JONES):

S. 1592. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide a safe harbor for financial institutions that maintain a customer account or customer transaction at the request of a Federal or State law enforcement agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. GARDNER, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 1593. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an energy storage research program, a demonstration program, and a technical assistance and grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1594. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for unlimited eligibility for health care for mental illnesses for veterans of combat service during certain periods of hostilities and war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1595. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to limit overdraft fees and establish fair and transparent practices related to the

marketing and provision of overdraft coverage programs at depository institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 1596. A bill to impose a moratorium on large agribusiness, food and beverage manufacturing, and grocery retail mergers, and to establish a commission to review large agriculture, food and beverage manufacturing, and grocery retail mergers, concentration, and market power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 1597. A bill to designate certain Bureau of Land Management land in the State of Oregon as wilderness, to authorize certain land exchanges in the State of Oregon, and to convey certain Bureau of Land Management land in the State of Oregon to the city of Mitchell, Oregon, and Wheeler County, Oregon, for economic and community development purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. KAINE, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 1598. A bill to exempt children of certain Filipino World War II veterans from the numerical limitations on immigrant visas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. JONES):

S. 1599. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create a refundable tax credit for foster families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1600. A bill to support States in their work to end preventable morbidity and mortality in maternity care by using evidence-based quality improvement to protect the health of mothers during pregnancy, childbirth, and in the postpartum period and to reduce neonatal and infant mortality, to eliminate racial disparities in maternal health outcomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 1601. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to issue a rule requiring all new passenger motor vehicles to be equipped with a child safety alert system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. SMITH, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. COONS, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. KING):

S. 1602. A bill to amend the United States Energy Storage Competitiveness Act of 2007 to establish a research, development, and demonstration program for grid-scale energy storage systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KING (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1603. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the standard charitable mileage rate for delivery of meals to elderly, disabled, frail, and at-risk individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1604. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize certain programs relating to nonpoint source management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. KAINE, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1605. A bill to make available necessary disaster assistance for families affected by major disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1606. A bill to ensure the digital contents of electronic equipment and online accounts belonging to or in the possession of United States persons entering or exiting the United States are adequately protected at the border, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 1607. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide protections for patients scheduling non-emergency procedures at in-network hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Ms. SINEMA, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1608. A bill to provide for the publication by the Secretary of Health and Human Services of physical activity recommendations for Americans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1609. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1934 to require country-by-country reporting; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 1610. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the global intangible low-taxed income by repealing the tax-free deemed return on investments and determining net CFC tested income on a per-country basis; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1611. A bill to ensure appropriate prioritization, spectrum planning, and interagency coordination to support the Internet of Things; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. SMITH):

S. 1612. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to support community college and industry partnerships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. SMITH, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BOOKER, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1613. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to update and modernize the reporting requirements for contaminants, including lead, in drinking water, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. KING, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1614. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to modify the definition of "renewable bio-

mass" under the renewable fuel program; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 1615. A bill to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to provide compensation and credit for retired pay purposes for maternity leave taken by members of the reserve components, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 1616. A bill to amend title VII of the Social Security Act to improve the Social Security Administration's procedures to close or reduce access to field offices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 1617. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the listing of patents in the Orange Book; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. KAINE, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1618. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to expand the capacity to improve health outcomes and increase access to specialized care; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 1619. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a national campaign to raise awareness of the importance of, and combat misinformation about, vaccines in order to increase vaccination rates; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KING (for himself, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. ALEXANDER):

S. 1620. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to exempt from inspection the slaughter of animals and the preparation of carcasses conducted at a custom slaughter facility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 1621. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in awarding a contract for the procurement of good or services, to give a preference to offerors that employ veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CASSIDY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Ms. ERNST):

S. 1622. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to list fentanyl-related substances as schedule I controlled substances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1623. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow for distributions from 529 accounts for expenses associated with registered apprenticeship programs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

S. 1624. A bill to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to improve services for survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking and their families; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1625. A bill to promote the deployment of commercial fifth-generation mobile networks and the sharing of information with communications providers in the United States regarding security risks to the networks of those providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 1626. A bill to require the National Telecommunications and Information Administration to estimate the value of electromagnetic spectrum assigned or otherwise allocated to Federal entities; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. Kaine, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SCHATZ, and Ms. SMITH):

S. Res. 218. A resolution recognizing the significance of Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month as an important time to celebrate the significant contributions of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders to the history of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 177

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 177, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 203

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 203, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the railroad track maintenance credit, and for other purposes.

S. 237

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 237, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit nurse practitioners and physician assistants to satisfy the documentation requirement under the Medicare program for coverage of certain shoes for individuals with diabetes.

S. 249

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 249, a bill to direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to regain observer status for Taiwan in the World Health Organization, and for other purposes.

S. 400

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 400, a bill to gather information about the illicit production of illicit fentanyl in foreign countries and to withhold bilateral assistance from countries that do not have emergency scheduling procedures for new illicit drugs, cannot prosecute criminals for the manufacture or distribution of controlled substance analogues, or do not require the registration of tableting machine and encapsulating machines.

S. 429

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 429, a bill to require the establishment of exchange programs relating to cybersecurity positions between the private sector and certain Federal agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 457

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) were added as cosponsors of S. 457, a bill to require that \$1 coins issued during 2019 honor President George H.W. Bush and to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bullion coins during 2019 in honor of Barbara Bush.

S. 569

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 569, a bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations relating to commercial motor vehicle drivers under the age of 21, and for other purposes.

S. 640

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) were added as cosponsors of S. 640, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require phar-

macy-negotiated price concessions to be included in negotiated prices at the point-of-sale under part D of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 679

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) were added as cosponsors of S. 679, a bill to exempt from the calculation of monthly income certain benefit paid by the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense.

S. 784

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 784, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to expand the military student identifier program to cover students with a parent who serves in the reserve component of the Armed Forces.

S. 851

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 851, a bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to issue an occupational safety and health standard that requires covered employers within the health care and social service industries to develop and implement a comprehensive workplace violence prevention plan, and for other purposes.

S. 852

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 852, a bill to provide for the consideration of a definition of anti-Semitism for the enforcement of Federal antidiscrimination laws concerning education programs or activities.

S. 880

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 880, a bill to provide outreach and reporting on comprehensive Alzheimer's disease care planning services furnished under the Medicare program.

S. 916

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 916, a bill to improve Federal efforts with respect to the prevention of maternal mortality, and for other purposes.

S. 943

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 943, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide capacity-building assistance to institutions of higher education to examine and address inequities in college student access and success, and for other purposes.

S. 944

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms.

HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 944, a bill to enhance the security operations of the Transportation Security Administration and the stability of the transportation security workforce by applying a unified personnel system under title 5, United States Code, to employees of the Transportation Security Administration who are responsible for screening passengers and property, and for other purposes.

S. 952

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 952, a bill to provide that the Federal Communications Commission may not prevent a State or Federal correctional facility from utilizing jamming equipment, and for other purposes.

S. 980

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 980, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of services for homeless veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 1007

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1007, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1015

At the request of Mr. BURR, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) were added as cosponsors of S. 1015, a bill to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to review and make certain revisions to the Standard Occupational Classification System, and for other purposes.

S. 1081

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1081, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide permanent, dedicated funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 1083

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms.

HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1083, a bill to address the fundamental injustice, cruelty, brutality, and inhumanity of slavery in the United States and the 13 American colonies between 1619 and 1865 and to establish a commission to study and consider a national apology and proposal for reparations for the institution of slavery, its subsequent de jure and de facto racial and economic discrimination against African-Americans, and the impact of these forces on living African-Americans, to make recommendations to the Congress on appropriate remedies, and for other purposes.

S. 1170

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1170, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to establish additional criteria for determining when employers may join together in a group or association of employers that will be treated as an employer under section 3(5) of such Act for purposes of sponsoring a group health plan, and for other purposes.

S. 1174

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1174, a bill to provide that 12 weeks of leave made available to a Federal employee shall be paid leave, and for other purposes.

S. 1200

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1200, a bill to create protections for depository institutions that provide financial services to cannabis-related legitimate businesses and service providers for such businesses, and for other purposes.

S. 1209

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1209, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to approval of abbreviated new drug applications.

S. 1210

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1210, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase and make permanent the exclusion for benefits provided to volunteer firefighters and emergency medical responders.

S. 1235

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1235, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of ratification of the 19th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, giving women in the United States the right to vote.

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 1235, supra.

S. 1258

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1258, a bill to prohibit the sale of tobacco products to individuals under the age of 21.

S. 1328

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1328, a bill to designate foreign persons who improperly interfere in United States elections as inadmissible aliens, and for other purposes.

S. 1337

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1337, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish an Office of Correctional Education, and for other purposes.

S. 1340

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1340, a bill to authorize activities to combat the Ebola outbreak in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and for other purposes.

S. 1343

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1343, a bill to amend title XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to improve Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program for low-income mothers.

S. 1394

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1394, a bill to provide collective bargaining rights for public safety officers employed by States or their political subdivisions.

S. 1403

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1403, a bill to amend the Child Care Access Means Parents in School Program under the Higher Education Act of 1965.

S. 1416

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1416, a bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to prohibit anticompetitive behaviors by drug

product manufacturers, and for other purposes.

S. 1461

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1461, a bill to require health insurance coverage for the treatment of infertility.

S. 1500

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1500, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve and enhance protections for members of the Armed Forces who are victims of a sex-related or domestic violence offense, and for other purposes.

S. 1506

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1506, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to permit certain individuals complying with State law to possess firearms.

S. 1578

At the request of Mr. HAWLEY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1578, a bill to protect the privacy of internet users through the establishment of a national Do Not Track system, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 9

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 9, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that tax-exempt fraternal benefit societies have historically provided and continue to provide critical benefits to the people and communities of the United States.

S. RES. 135

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 135, a resolution expressing the gratitude and appreciation of the Senate for the acts of heroism and valor by the members of the United States Armed Forces who participated in the June 6, 1944, amphibious landing at Normandy, France, and commending those individuals for leadership and bravery in an operation that helped bring an end to World War II.

S. RES. 217

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 217, a resolution expressing support for the designation of June 7 through June 9, 2019, as "National Gun Violence Awareness Weekend" and June 2019 as "National Gun Violence Awareness Month".

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. Kaine (for himself and Mr. Jones):

S. 1599. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create a refundable tax credit for foster families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Foster Care Tax Credit Act, with my colleague Senator Jones. Enacting this bill would go a long way towards helping families with the expenses that come with taking in and providing homes for foster children.

Currently, foster families are only eligible for the Child Tax Credit if the same child lives with them for at least six months. Many foster families take in children for shorter periods, and sometimes take in multiple different children throughout the year. Even if these placements add up to more than six months, these families are potentially not eligible for the tax credit. Further, state funding for foster care families often fails to cover the cost of meeting the child's basic needs.

The Foster Care Tax Credit Act would create a new refundable tax credit targeted at these families that take in foster children but are not eligible for the Child Tax Credit. The tax credit would help ease the financial strain that many of these families face. Further, the bill instructs the Secretary of Health and Human Services and Secretary of the Treasury to conduct outreach to state and tribal agencies to better educate foster families about provisions of the tax code that may benefit them.

I hope my colleagues will support this bill to provide assistance to families who have chosen to offer a loving home for children who need it most.

By Mr. Wyden (for himself, Mr. Risch, Mr. King, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Merkley, and Ms. Collins):

S. 1614. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to modify the definition of "renewable biomass" under the renewable fuel program; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. Wyden. Mr. President, Oregonians have a strong interest in using biomass as a source of renewable fuels. This desire, coupled with how well we grow biomass in Oregon, creates the opportunity to use carefully selected wood waste as a source for cleaner transportation fuel. If we do it right, this effort will lead to healthier forests, more carbon sequestration, cleaner transportation fuels as compared to traditional gasolines, and protected old growth forests.

Current law excludes the use of federal biomass in the making of renewable fuels as defined by the Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS). The bill being introduced today eliminates that exclusion.

In addition to being an energy matter, this is an important forest management issue. Over many decades there has been an unnatural buildup of woody material on the forest floor. It

becomes fuel for catastrophic wildfires. For months, each summer, Oregonians in every corner of the state, from Astoria to Adel and from Medford to Madras, suffer from smokey skies, hazardous air quality, and the almost constant threat that a wildfire may burn down their homes. In the eastern portion of the state, invasive species like juniper trees pose challenges, on both private and public lands—lowering water tables, posing fire risks, and encroaching on sage grouse habitat. It is time we stopped putting our heads in the sand, hoping the environmental ship will right itself.

Instead, this excess woody biomass should be contributing to U.S. energy independence by being converted to transportation or electricity fuels. This bill makes that economically feasible. It would make it more cost efficient for private landowners to remove low-value brush, like juniper. The bill also helps pay for programs to reduce dead and dying trees that fuel catastrophic wildfires and helps thin out unhealthy second-growth forests. The bill ensures that all residuals from the milling process and certain biomass from national forests and BLM forests qualify for the RFS standards.

Importantly, under this new definition biomass materials harvested from federal lands must be done so in accordance with all federal laws, regulations, and land-use plans and designations. In addition, the bill pays specific attention to biomass removal from insect and disease ridden forests and wildfire prone areas. And, to ensure environmental problems are being solved, not created, the bill restricts the types of biomass materials that can be harvested from federal lands so that old growth trees and stands will continue to be protected.

At the end of the day, the small diameter trees, the limbs, the debris, even sawdust at the mill presents real opportunities to generate green energy, generate green jobs, lower wildfire risks in rural areas across the country, and better position the United States to meet the RFS.

There is a lot of bipartisan support for the biomass definition in this bill. It balances sound energy policy with sound environmental policy.

I want to thank my colleagues Senators Risch, King, Crapo, and Merkley for joining me on this important bill.

By Ms. Collins (for herself, Mr. Heinrich, Ms. Smith, Mr. Gardner, Mr. Coons, Ms. Mccsally, and Mr. King):

S. 1602. A bill to amend the United States Energy Storage Competitiveness Act of 2007 to establish a research, development, and demonstration program for grid-scale energy storage systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. Collins. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Better Energy

Storage Technology Act. I am pleased to be partnering with Senator HEINRICH on this initiative. I would also like to thank Senator GARDNER, Senator SMITH, Senator COONS, Senator MCSALLY, and Senator KING who have joined us as original cosponsors of the BEST Act.

Our bipartisan bill supports narrowly tailored energy storage research to develop the next generation of technologies at the Department of Energy. Advancing next generation energy storage technology will allow us to integrate more renewables into the power grid, such as wind energy or solar energy which, in turn, will help to reduce emissions and slow climate change.

Energy storage systems provide a wide range of benefits. First, these technologies increase the reliability and the resilience of the electric grid by limiting potential disruptions. Energy storage helps us to better manage supply and demand on the grid and allows for the expanded use of renewable energy. The reliability of our grid and grid-scale storage systems go hand-in-hand.

Second, this type of technology can decrease energy costs, a goal that we all share. In Maine, the price of electricity rises steeply during the coldest days of the year. For example, in late 2017 and early 2018, very cold temperatures in New England led to higher energy costs—more than a billion dollars in the wholesale energy market—in just 15 days.

The next generation of energy storage technologies could help to transform our grid, meaning that we would no longer need to generate more expensive power to meet demands during the hottest and coldest days of the year. Instead, we could use more affordable energy sources that have been stored for later use.

Third, energy storage systems can allow for more intermittent renewable sources, such as wind and solar power, to be placed on the grid and used precisely when they are needed. The Aqua Ventus, a floating, deepwater offshore wind project being developed by the University of Maine and a consortium of groups, could benefit from energy storage innovation. Off the coast of Maine, there are very strong and consistent winds where offshore wind turbines can produce electricity almost 50 percent of the time. This next generation storage technology will ensure that we can use this wind power closer to 100 percent of the time by storing electricity to use when the wind isn't blowing.

One of the biggest hurdles to commercializing energy storage is cost. To overcome this obstacle, our bill specifically directs the Department of Energy to work to decrease the cost of this exciting technology. This is similar to the Department's SunShot initiative that decreased the price of solar power by approximately 75 percent in less than a decade.

Furthermore, energy storage systems are technology neutral. This bill will foster innovation and enhance deployment of these innovative technologies without picking winners or losers.

Specifically, our bill would do the following: It would focus energy storage research on highly flexible, longer duration, and seasonal storage systems. It would support five energy storage demonstration projects. The bill would create a strategic plan and allow the Department of Energy to develop cost targets. It would coordinate research and support the coordination of research. Finally, the bill would authorize \$60 million annually for each of the next 5 years.

I am pleased to report that our bipartisan bill has earned very broad support, including the endorsements of the Bipartisan Policy Center, Citizens for Responsible Energy Solutions, ClearPath, Edison Electric Institute, Energy Storage Association, the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, the National Audubon Society, the Natural Resources Council of Maine, the National Hydropower Association, Solar Energy Industries Association, the Union of Concerned Scientists, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Frankly, it has been a long time since I have seen a bill be able to attract that much support from groups that have different ideological goals, and I am very proud that we were able to line up the support of all of those groups.

The BEST Act will help advance energy storage technologies to improve the efficiency of our Nation's electrical grid while helping to promote the wider use of clean, renewable energy. The goals of this bill are those which I would hope every Member of this body could embrace. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Thank you, Mr. President.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 218—RECOGNIZING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF ASIAN/PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH AS AN IMPORTANT TIME TO CELEBRATE THE SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTIONS OF ASIAN AMERICANS AND PACIFIC ISLANDERS TO THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. Kaine, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SCHATZ, and Ms. SMITH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 218

Whereas the people of the United States join together each May to pay tribute to the

contributions of generations of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders who have enriched the history of the United States;

Whereas the history of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in the United States is inextricably tied to the story of the United States;

Whereas the Asian American and Pacific Islander community is an inherently diverse population, composed of more than 45 distinct ethnicities and more than 100 language dialects;

Whereas, according to the Bureau of the Census, the Asian American population grew faster than any other racial or ethnic group over the last decade, surging nearly 72 percent between 2000 and 2015;

Whereas there are approximately 22,000,000 residents of the United States who identify themselves as Asian and approximately 1,600,000 residents of the United States who identify themselves as Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, making up nearly 7 percent of the total population of the United States;

Whereas the month of May was selected for Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month because the first Japanese immigrants arrived in the United States on May 7, 1843, and the first transcontinental railroad was completed on May 10, 1869, with substantial contributions from Chinese immigrants;

Whereas section 102 of title 36, United States Code, officially designates May as Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month and requests the President to issue an annual proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities;

Whereas 2019 marks several important milestones for the Asian American and Pacific Islander community, including—

(1) the 25th anniversary of the establishment of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, a bicameral caucus of Members of Congress advocating on behalf of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, which, in 2019, is composed of 73 Members, including 19 Members of Asian or Pacific Islander descent;

(2) the 25th anniversary of the establishment of the Asian Pacific American Institute for Congressional Studies, which was founded alongside the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus by former Secretary of Commerce and Secretary of Transportation Norman Y. Mineta and former Delegate to the United States House of Representatives from Guam Robert Underwood;

(3) the 40th anniversary of the first Asian/Pacific American Heritage Week, designated in 1979 by President Jimmy Carter through Presidential Proclamation No. 4650;

(4) the 45th anniversary of *Lau v. Nichols*, 414 U.S. 563 (1974), in which the Supreme Court of the United States determined that inadequate supplemental language instruction for students of Chinese ancestry with limited English proficiency violated the Civil Rights Act of 1964, expanding equal educational opportunities and paving the way for bilingual programs and additional English language instruction in public schools;

(5) the 95th anniversary of the enactment of the Immigration Act of 1924 (commonly known as the "Johnson-Reed Act") (43 Stat. 153, chapter 190), which imposed national origin quotas that limited the number of immigrants allowed entry to the United States and prohibited the entry of Asian immigrants; and

(6) the 150th anniversary of the completion of the first transcontinental railroad, which—

(A) in 1869, connected the Central Pacific Railroad and the Union Pacific Railroad at Promontory Summit, Utah; and

(B) involved more than 12,000 Chinese laborers who faced racial and wage discrimination despite being entrusted with the most laborious tasks;

Whereas Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders have made significant contributions to the United States at all levels of the Federal Government and the United States Armed Forces, including—

(1) Daniel K. Inouye, a Medal of Honor and Presidential Medal of Freedom recipient who, as President Pro Tempore of the Senate, was the highest-ranking Asian American government official in the history of the United States;

(2) Dalip Singh Saund, the first Asian American Congressman;

(3) Patsy T. Mink, the first woman of color and Asian American woman to be elected to Congress;

(4) Hiram L. Fong, the first Asian American Senator;

(5) Daniel K. Akaka, the first Senator of Native Hawaiian ancestry;

(6) Norman Y. Mineta, the first Asian American member of a Presidential cabinet; and

(7) Elaine L. Chao, the first Asian American woman member of a Presidential cabinet;

Whereas, in 2019, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders are serving in State and Territorial legislatures across the United States in record numbers, including in—

(1) the States of Alaska, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming; and

(2) the Territories of American Samoa, Guam, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands;

Whereas, in 2019, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders honorably serve throughout the Federal judiciary;

Whereas there remains much to be done to ensure that Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders have access to resources and a voice in the Government of the United States and continue to advance in the political landscape of the United States; and

Whereas celebrating Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month provides the people of the United States with an opportunity to recognize the achievements, contributions, and history of, and to understand the challenges faced by, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the significance of Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month as an important time to celebrate the significant contributions of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders to the history of the United States; and

(2) recognizes that Asian American and Pacific Islander communities enhance the rich diversity of and strengthen the United States.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I have 9 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2019, at 9 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2019, at 9:45 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2019, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2019, at 1:45 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Daniel Aaron Bress, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, Michael S. Bogren, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Michigan, Stephanie Dawkins Davis, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan, Jason K. Pulliam, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas, Frank William Volk, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of

West Virginia, and David Austin Tapp, of Kentucky, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL SPENDING OVERSIGHT AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

The Subcommittee on Federal Spending Oversight and Emergency Management of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 22, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

RECESS UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow on Thursday, May 23, 2019.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:12 p.m., recessed until Thursday, May 23, 2019, at 9:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 22, 2019:

THE JUDICIARY

HOWARD C. NIELSON, JR., OF UTAH, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH.

STEPHEN R. CLARK, SR., OF MISSOURI, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI.

CARL J. NICHOLS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

KENNETH D. BELL, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA.